

LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, N. J.

BR 1705 .B85
Bright, William, 1824-1901.
Lessons from the lives of
three great fathers





LESSONS

FROM THE LIVES OF

THREE GREAT FATHERS

a

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

FAITH AND LIFE: Readings for the greater Holy Days, and the Sundays from Advent to Trinity. Compiled from Ancient Writers. *Second Edition.* Small 8vo. 5s.

THE INCARNATION AS A MOTIVE POWER. Crown 8vo. 6s.

IONA AND OTHER VERSES. Small 8vo. 4s. 6d.

HYMNS AND OTHER VERSES. Fools-cap 8vo. 5s.

LIBER PRECUM PUBLICARUM ECCLESIAE ANGLICANÆ. A GUILIELMO BRIGHIT, S.T.P., Edis Christi apud Oxon. Canonico, Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ, Professore Regio, et PETRO GOLDSMITH MEDD, A.M., Eccles. Cath. S. Albani Canonico Honorario Rectore de North Cerney, olim Collegii Universitatis apud Oxon. Socio Seniore. Latine redditus. [In hac Editione continentur Versiones Latine—1. Libri Precum Publicarum Ecclesie Anglicanæ; 2. Liturgiæ Primæ Reformatæ; 3. Liturgiæ Scoticancæ; 4. Liturgiæ Americanæ.] *Editio Quarta*, cum Appendice. *With Rubrics in red.* Small 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LONDON: LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

LESSONS

FROM THE LIVES OF

THREE GREAT FATHERS

WITH APPENDICES

BY
WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D.

CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD
REGIUS PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN

LONDON

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

AND NEW YORK: 15 EAST 16th STREET

1890



TO THE DEAR AND HOLY MEMORY OF

HENRY PARRY LIDDON,

WHOSE HIGH SOUL ASSIMILATED AS BY INSTINCT

WHATEVER WAS NOBLEST IN ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY,

WHILE IT SAW DEEP INTO THE SPIRITUAL NEEDS

AND SPOKE FOR CHRIST TO THE MIND AND CONSCIENCE

OF MODERN ENGLAND.

P R E F A C E

THIS book contains, in the first place, an enlarged form of addresses on the lives of St. Athanasius, St. Chrysostom, and St. Augustine, which were delivered in the Cathedral at Oxford, on some week-day evenings during an Advent.

It was not then to the purpose, nor has it been now attempted, to produce anything like complete biographies, but rather to dwell on such leading features of life and character as might be found peculiarly interesting and suggestive. A fuller account of the career of Athanasius will be found in the "Introductions" to his "Orations against the Arians," and his "Historical Writings," as reprinted at the Clarendon Press in 1873 and 1881.

The Appendices are intended to illustrate,—but only by way of help to further study,—some features of the “Lives,” or important points connected with them, which required fuller treatment than could be given in the text or in footnotes.

No further prefatory words would be appropriate, were it not that, since the death of the great man whose name is so frequently referred to in these pages, and whose earthly course, like that of him to whose memory they are sorrowfully dedicated, was closed while they were passing through the press, attention has not unnaturally been called to Cardinal Newman’s own repeated statement, that it was “the study of the Fathers” which led him—just forty-five years since—to abandon the Church of England for that of Rome. English Churchmen, then, who retain the traditional Anglican reverence for those who, in no forbidden sense, are commonly

called the Fathers, may well be asked what they have to say to such an assertion ; and perhaps may answer somewhat as follows, with truest reverence, not so much for the wonderful genius as for the pure and lofty goodness of one who so habitually desired, as he expressed it in the pathetic farewell at Littlemore, that in “all things he might know God’s will, and at all times might be ready to fulfil it.”¹

His course, in the first place, was determined by an intense individuality—by interior tendencies and impulses which kept him solitary among friends and fellow-workers, —which made him seem, at various times of his life, “mysterious and inexplicable.” And then we see, in particular, that his “study of the Fathers,” in the critical years beginning with 1839, was insensibly affected by a Rome-ward bias, which owed some of its strength

¹ *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, p. 464.

to an unmistakable vein of mysticism. Assuredly nothing else will account for what has been called his “amazing discovery, which led to so much, of our likeness” (or “awful similitude,” as he himself called it), “to the Monophysites”¹ of the days of St. Leo; for the facility with which a mind of extraordinary subtlety, which found special delight in the elaboration of distinctions, was arrested, and, as it were, carried out of itself, by one of the most unsubstantial of false analogies,—as if those Orientals who, while not going the whole length with Eutychians proper, objected to such language as Leo (most wisely and successfully) pressed on the Church about our Lord’s existence “*in* two natures,” were the actual prototypes of English Churchmen who, while believing with Leo, and with the whole of orthodox

¹ Christian Remembrancer, xlviii. 186 (on “Dr. Newman’s Apology”).

Christendom, Eastern and Western, from the Council of Chalcedon onwards, on the great question then at issue, rejected the distinctively Roman system as built up in the Middle Ages and consolidated at the Council of Trent.¹ A subsequent passage explains that “the history of St. Leo showed that the deliberate and eventual consent of the great body of the Church ratified a doctrinal decision,” and also “that the rule of antiquity was not infringed, though a doctrine had not been publicly recognised, as a portion of the dogmatic foundation of the Church, till centuries after the time of the Apostles.” But the first point could not make for Romanism, unless “the great body of the

¹ See the passage in the “Apologia,” p. 209, ed. 1: “I saw my face in that mirror, and I was a Monophysite. The Church of the Via Media was in the position of the Oriental communion” (surely an inexact phrase for what was meant); “Rome was what she now is” (all the difference between the positions of Leo I. and of Pius IV. or Gregory XVI. being absolutely ignored), “and the Protestants were the Eutychians.”

Church" could be identified with the Latin "obedience;" and, as to the second, the recognition of "In two natures" was simply analogous to that of the Homoousion; it was not a new doctrine imposed, but an old doctrine elucidated. Similarly, soon after this "discovery," the terse dictum of St. Augustine as to the case of the African Catholics, supported by the rest of Christendom, against the Donatists, "Securus judicat orbis terrarum,"¹ seemed to "ring in" Mr. Newman's "ears with a power" reminding him of "the 'Tolle, lege,' which converted St. Augustine himself," until it "pulverised," for him, "the theory of the *Via Media*," by suggesting for the "decision of ecclesiastical questions a simpler rule than that of antiquity, —that the deliberate judgment in which the

¹ C. Epist. Parmen. iii. 24. The context further explains what he meant by "orbis terrarum :" "in tanta multitudine gentium quacunque Christi hæreditas patet :" cf. ib. i. 1, "ecclesiam toto orbe diffusam," etc.

whole Church at length rests and acquiesces is an infallible prescription¹ and a final sentence against such portions of it as protest and secede."

"The whole Church" is here, without further argument, assumed to be equivalent to the Roman communion; but that assumption, of course, involves logically submission to Rome. In the "Apologia" is described, apparently without any suspicion of the inference to be drawn from it, the "excitement" produced by this "dreadful misgiving" as to the tenability of Anglicanism; it was the sensation of having "seen a ghost, the shadow of a hand upon the wall;" it was "a sudden visitation," the true bearing of which, however, had yet to be ascertained. "If it came from above, it would come again;" meantime, "I determined to be guided, not by my

¹ In Tertullian's sense, a *prescriptio*, or plea in bar of a litigant's right.

imagination, but by my reason. . . . However, my new historical fact had to a certain point a logical force: down had come the *Via Media*, as a definite theory, . . . under the blows of St. Leo;” such logical force being, in fact, ascribed to it on the assumption already mentioned, and in disregard of true historical relevancy. Two years later, while the “translation of St. Athanasius” (a work of surpassing value, although marked here and there by oversubtlety¹) was in progress, “the ghost came a second time;” it was now the Semi-Arians who were shadows cast before of Anglicanism as distinct from Protestantism; again the same unconscious “*petitio principii*,” as if Athanasius, and those who with him insisted on the maintenance of the Nicene Creed,

¹ *E.g.* in some of the headings and notes to the context in which Athanasius recognises a limitation of knowledge (not fallibility) in our Lord *as Man*, while upon earth.

could furnish a precedent for the Roman anathemas against all who withhold their assent from Roman doctrine.¹ Already (in

¹ In a deeply interesting paper on Cardinal Newman, in "Good Words" for October, 1890, Mr. R. H. Hutton says that "Newman was struck with the fact that even in the early controversies on the nature and divinity of Christ there were controversialists who took this middle line, and who were supported by the State, by Constantine and his successors, purely because they did take this middle line, and did not run into extremes,—for example, the Semi-Arians and the Monophysites," etc. The same remark is made in Mr. Hutton's volume, "Cardinal Newman," the first of a series on "English Leaders of Religion." Now, as to "State support," the Semi-Arians had none of it after Constantius abandoned them in 359 in favour of Homoean or Acacian Arianism; and under Valens their leaders were exiled for holding a synod. The Monophysites of Egypt had State patronage for about a year, and afterwards stood out against orthodox Emperors, and vituperated the orthodox as "King's men." (Something, too, might be said of the "State support" which Leo, in Western Church affairs, procured from his own Emperor.) But, as to the main point, any *soi-disant* Via Media must be judged on its own merits: has it a right to a title which, if there are such things as religious "extremes," is an honour? First, then, Semi-Arianism as a formulated theory (apart from such objections to the Homoousion as were founded on misconception), and Monophysitism in the restricted and technical sense, were not *Viae Mediae* at all, but merely inconsistent modifications of those Arian and Eutychian "extremes" to which the opposites were Sabelianism and Nestorianism. It was Athanasius and Leo that

October, 1840) an ominous sentence had appeared in a letter to a friend, which is quoted at length in the "Apologia." "The arguments which I have published against Romanism seem to myself as cogent as ever, but men go by their sympathies, not by argument; and if I feel the force of this influence myself, who bow to the arguments, why may not others still more," etc.

We seem, then, to be warranted in concluding that it was not patristic study in itself, but the impression produced by certain points in that study—by certain figures in patristic history, as seen in the magic "mirror" of an imagination looking out for signs and stimu-

were really in a *Via Media* : and Leo repeatedly insists that the doctrine of One Christ in two natures is the truth which condemns alike Nestorius and Eutyches. And secondly, in order to set aside, as illegitimate, a *Via Media* on the Roman question, it has to be proved that Rome is not "extreme" in the authoritative and dogmatic direction, *i.e.* that she is right on that question, as Athanasius and Leo were on the questions of the Trinity and the Incarnation ; which is just what Anglicans deny on grounds theological and historical.

lated by a growing “sympathy”¹ with Rome,—that told with the author of “The Church of the Fathers” against that native Church which he, more than any one else, had roused to a sense of its Catholic vitality, but which, as he knew it, failed to satisfy some urgent demands of his own nature. One would infer that, apart from the active presence of popular Protestantism among its members, the English Church all along seemed to him too small, tame, and prosaic, deficient in mystery and in majesty, complacently obsequious to the State, inclined to a comfortable worldliness, and very unlike his own ideal of the kingdom of Christ as a truly “imperial

¹ It may be objected that, according to Anglican apologetics, “the Christian evidences presuppose a certain moral sympathy in an inquirer” (Liddon, Univ. Serm. ii. 216), that “certain religious instincts and affections form a ground of belief antecedent to external evidence” (Mozley, Lectures, p. 7). But Newman’s craving for a Pope did not stand on the level of such predispositions; it was not, like them, representative of a normal spiritual principle of human nature, nor bound up with the moral bearings of religious belief.

power."¹ It belongs to an idealising mind to manipulate facts while it thinks it is observing them ; and although no one would have shrunk with more sincere aversion from the "dishonesty of distorting history for the sake of theory,"² yet Newman's own temperament, always characterised by a peculiar and absorbing self-consciousness, might present the facts of history to his judgment in a more or less distorted form.

Once more, when at last he submitted to Rome, he did so, as is well known, on a theory of doctrinal development, "which," as he tells us, he had "begun to consider steadily in 1843," some two years before his secession. It has been described by an acute critic³ as wholly distinct from that view of "explanatory" developments of Christian

¹ See *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, p. 245, etc.

² Newman, *Historical Sketches*, iii. 342.

³ Professor Mozley, *The Theory of Development*, p. 144 ff. Cp. Sir W. Palmer on Development, p. 148.

doctrine which all Christians admit, and which is illustrated by the Nicene Creed in regard to the Divine Sonship, and by other received formulas in regard to the Divine Incarnation. A statement is made, but its meaning has to be “developed,” so as to bar out misapprehension, and to bring out into fuller light what it really and originally contains;¹ but nothing is thus added to its substance, — whereas “there is a kind of development which is a positive increase of the substance of the thing developed,— a fresh formation not contained in, though growing out of,” the “original matter,” as when an acorn gradually produces an oak. The “development” of which a “theory” was elaborated was of the latter kind; the doctrinal “idea” being supposed gradually to expand and “perfect” itself, to grow in

¹ “*Improbatio hæreticorum facit eminere quid Ecclesia tua sentiat, et quid habeat sana doctrina:*” S. Aug. Conf. vii. 25. Comp. Vincent. Lirin. Commonit. c. 22, 23.

its actual body or substance, to form around itself new ideas, and thus fresh truths, under the guidance of a continuous revelation enshrined in the teaching power of the Church. Undoubtedly one drawback to this hypothesis was the necessity of applying it to the orthodox Christology, and the advantage which might thus be taken by arguers who, from the “undogmatic” standpoint, would represent Nicene doctrine as an exaggeration, while denying any authority commissioned to exaggerate.¹ But the theory was necessary for a patristic scholar who had to adopt Romanism *en bloc*. The “lives” before us, for instance, answer the question, whether the fundamental Roman propositions

¹ “On the Roman side of the parallel, the implicit doctrine has the relation to the developed of no more than a seed or element. Then on the Nicene side it must be the same. . . . If the Nicene growth sanction the later” (Roman) “growth, it must be real growth; now the Nicene doctrine as to our Lord is *no more than that He was very God*” (see below, p. 15); “the primitive doctrine, then, must have been less.” Mozley, p. 207, cp. ib. 163-167.

about the Papacy were held and acted upon by the Church of “three great Fathers.” If, when Arianism came in like a flood, the Roman see had been acknowledged as infallible, Sylvester I. must have been called upon to abate a controversy so disastrous to Christian interests by discharging a function which could never have been more opportunely exercised. Chrysostom, in his troubles, applied for assistance to Pope Innocent, not as to the one final judge of all cases between bishops, but as the most eminent and influential of Western prelates: he even wrote in duplicate forms to the bishops of Milan and Aquileia.¹ And although Augustine spoke of the great “apostolic see” of the West with reverential observance, he took part in that African resolution to “verify references” given by a Roman legate which exposed the attempt

¹ See Oxf. Transl. of Fleury, ed. Newman, ii. 95.

—made probably in ignorance—to urge as “Nicene” a canon investing Rome with a certain appellate jurisdiction, by proving that the canon had never existed in the Nicene text.¹ Such facts would be a difficulty to the old-fashioned Roman Catholic, who believed that every part of his Church’s system had come down straight from primitive times. But one who employed the new theory could put them aside as merely illustrating his point—that the evolution of Papal powers had been very gradual. He might, however, be asked whether his theory had been accepted by the authorities ; and on that question he could not say much.² What

¹ *Ibid.*, 344. Compare also the notes in iii. 93, 359, on Pope Celestine’s recognition of the apostolic office as shared by all bishops, and on the reception of Leo’s “Tome” at Chalcedon (or previously), “not as a final, judicial decision,” but as tested by existing standards, and found to agree with them. These notes had the editor’s approval.

² See Palmer, p. 228 ff. He considers that Möhler’s “development” does not go beyond “more distinct and definite views” of doctrine as brought out by controversy, p. 332. Cp. Archb. Trench, *Huls. Lect.* p. 85.

could he say now? So far from having been adopted as official, it appears to outsiders to have received a fatal rebuff. The Vatican decree of 1870 affirms the Papal jurisdiction, as plenary and sovereign, ordinary and immediate, both over and within all churches, to be "in accordance with the ancient and constant faith of the Church Universal:" it claims "the perpetual practice of the Church" as attesting the Papal infallibility on questions of faith and morals; and professes, in so defining it as a "dogma," to "adhere faithfully to the tradition received from the very beginning of Christian faith." And this decree, the "*Pastor Eternus*," was promulgated by Pius IX. "with the approval of the sacred Council." It would seem therefore to be, on Roman principles, not only infallible when it defines certain dogmas, but above question when it asserts that they have been held from the beginning. If so, one sees not

how it leaves room within the Roman area for a theory which admits that they have *not* been thus held ; and, at all events, its assertion on that subject is one which could not now be the result of anything like a “study of the Fathers.”

That study would be degraded if turned into an occasion of controversialism ; it would also be misused if it fostered an unpractical forgetfulness of the differences between our surroundings, our problems, or our tasks, and those of the Fathers,—or a tendency to idealise their times as a golden age of Church perfection. To dwell on this, indeed, is hardly in season. Men of our day are not likely to exalt individual Fathers into oracles, to profess entire satisfaction with their exegesis, to ignore the teachings of later experience as to some things which they more or less encouraged, or to neglect the light received through modern discussion and

research. It may be more apposite to guard against an ungracious and inequitable disparagement of their services to the cause of Christianity. Their lives, even more than their writings, are rich in material for what the Apostle, in a phrase which for many readers has well-nigh lost its significance, describes as “edification ;” they laboured to build up the house of the Lord in human characters. They were typical Christians, men in whom the spiritual life was dominant, whose rock-like faith could strengthen their brethren, who set loyalty to Christ above all earthly considerations, who made His Kingdom, as manifest in the Church, at once the home of their souls and the sphere of their best energies. And if any of us Englishmen, members of a Church whose position as “national” involves temptations as well as opportunities, and inheritors of a civilisation which might seem to be more and

more moving away from religion,¹ are at all in danger of taking up with a relaxed and secularised Christianity, of "fashioning ourselves in accordance with this *aiών*," the life temporal and social, as if—religious formulas notwithstanding—it were *the* life,—we may find in "the zeal and devotion and self-denying sanctity which were the notes of the early faith"² as embodied in men like Augustine, Chrysostom, or Athanasius, an enkindling and invigorating image of one main characteristic of the Christians of the New Testament, that by faith they overcame the world.

CHRIST CHURCH,
October 9, 1890.

¹ See Church, *The Gifts of Civilisation*, p. 117 ff.

² Prof. Shairp, *Aspects of Poetry*, p. 450.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
ST. ATHANASIUS	1
ST. CHRYSOSTOM	48
ST. AUGUSTINE	109

APPENDICES.

I. <i>Athanasius on the Doctrine of the Trinity</i>	185
II. <i>Athanasius on the Doctrine of the Incarnation</i>	194
III. <i>Athanasius on the Use of the Psalter</i>	200
IV. <i>Estimates of the Career of Athanasius</i>	204
V. <i>Extracts from Chrysostom's "De Sacerdotio"</i> <i>on the Preacher's Office</i>	207
VI. <i>Anomœanism</i>	231
VII. <i>Chrysostom on the Difficulties of the Episcopate</i>	237
VIII. <i>Chrysostom on the Fall, Free Will, and Grace</i>	242
IX. <i>Theophilus and the "Origenists"</i>	246
X. <i>Ritual Charges against Chrysostom</i>	252
XI. <i>Augustine's "Soliloquium"</i>	253
XII. <i>Augustine on Paganism</i>	257
XIII. <i>Augustine on "the City of God"</i>	263

	PAGE
XIV. <i>Augustine and the "Quicunque Vult"</i>	268
XV. <i>Augustine on the Question of Evil</i>	271
XVI. <i>The Charge against Felix of Aptunga</i>	275
XVII. <i>Augustine on the "Interior Church"</i>	280
XVIII. <i>Augustine on Christ's Agency in the Sacraments</i>	285
XIX. <i>Pelagian Senses of "Grace"</i>	289
XX. <i>Semi-Pelagianism</i>	292
XXI. <i>Jansenism</i>	303

ST. ATHANASIUS.

IN the beginning of 1832, a sermon was preached before the University of Oxford on "Personal Influence as a Means of Propagating the Truth." The preacher, a Fellow of Oriel, was then preparing for the press an elaborate work on "The Arians in the Fourth Century." He had been dwelling on "the advantages accruing to error in its struggle with truth," and had turned to the compensatory view which was indicated in the title of his sermon—the moral power of select souls, "ordained by God's providence to continue the succession of His witnesses." "A few highly endowed men,"—endowed, that is, with singular gifts, spiritual, moral, intellectual,—"will rescue the world for centuries

to come. Before now, even one man has impressed an image on the Church which, through God's mercy, shall not be effaced while time lasts." And a footnote explains the allusion in one word—"Athanasius."¹

In the Christmas week of that same year, the preacher, then travelling among the Greek islands, wrote three stanzas on "the Greek Fathers," which afterwards appeared in the "Lyra Apostolica." The last line but one in this little tribute to illustrious memories describes the greatest man in the whole series of "Fathers" as "royal-hearted Athanase,"—a felicitous epithet, which brings before us the native majesty of a spirit born to rule and guide; "the magnificent moral superiority," as an eloquent writer has said, which is felt to belong to Athanasius as he moves among his fellows, "the highest in aim, the mightiest in act, with a dominance

¹ Newman, Univ. Sermons, p. 97.

evident and irresistible ; ”¹ as he bears up, not less kinglike, when “beaten by wild breath of calumny, of exile, and of wrong,”² through that persistent Arian hostility of which Hooker says with pardonable exaggeration, that during the forty-six years of his episcopate he was “never suffered to enjoy the comfort of a peaceable day.” There is no rhetorical colouring in Hooker’s comment on the result of these machinations : “the issue always, on their part, shame,—on his, triumph.”³

It is, indeed, a wonderful story ; and it has some obvious attractions for many who do not much care for doctrinal questions as such, or who even regard them from a stand-point purely external. The adventures, so to speak, of the hero have all the fascination of a romance ; they might be said to form

¹ Church Quarterly Review, xiii. 225.

² Williams, The Cathedral, p. 286.

³ Hooker, E. P. v. 42. 2.

an ecclesiastical *Odyssey*, with its full share of light and shadow, its due proportion of hairbreadth escapes. Without reckoning the earlier years, during which he became the secretary and confidential deacon of Alexander, Archbishop of Alexandria, and made himself felt as a power in the First General Council,¹ his episcopal career, beginning apparently in the summer of 326, falls into seven periods, which conclude respectively with his first exile in 335, his escape to Rome in 340, his second restoration in 346, his second escape in 356, his exile under Julian in 362, his last escape in 365,² and his death in 373. As the drama of these times evolves itself, we see the small figure with the gravely beautiful face,³ ubiquitous

¹ Not, of course, as a constituent member, but as an attendant theologian, invited to speak, as the presbyter Malchion was at the Council of Antioch, in 269.

² A brief compulsory absence in the second year of Valens's reign.

³ Julian mentions one of these points, Gregory Nazianzen indicates the other.

and pre-eminent in the swiftly changing scene. He is sitting in Council with the hundred suffragans of his see ; or he is going on a round of visitations ; or he is taking steps to confute one or other of those libels, some grotesque and some atrocious, by which the Arian opponents of the Nicene faith sought to strike at it through the person of its chief representative. The variety and persistency of these inventions are a tribute to his greatness.¹ “ He has extorted money from the Alexandrians to procure linen vestments for his clergy ; ”² “ he has sent a purse of gold to a rebel ; ”³ “ he has threatened to stop the transport of Egyptian corn to Constantinople ; ”⁴ “ he poisoned the mind of the late Western Emperor Constans against *you*, Constantius Augustus ; ”⁵ “ he has corre-

¹ They are here arranged, not chronologically, but as referring to (1) breach of duty as a subject, (2) sacrilege, (3) murder and sorcery.

² Ath. Apol. c. Ari. 60.

³ Ib. 60.

⁴ Ib. 87.

⁵ Apol. ad Const. 2, ff.

sponded with a usurper ; ”¹ “ he has prematurely used a church built on imperial property ; ”² “ he ordered a priest to interrupt another priest while celebrating, the result being that the chalice was broken in the scuffle, and the holy table thrown down ; ”³ “ he murdered a bishop, in order to dismember him for magical purposes ; —and here, in this box, is one of the victim’s hands ! ”⁴ One of the most curious incidents in the story is the introduction, by Athanasius, of this “dead-alive” to the hostile council assembled at Tyre, when, after removing the

¹ *Apol. ad Const.* 6, ff.

² *Ib.* 14, ff.

³ Ischyras, the “priest,” was not a priest, for he had not been ordained by a bishop. On the day to which the incident was referred he was ill in bed, and that day was not one on which a celebration would have been usual : *Ath. Apol. c. Ari.* 11, 12, 28, 46, 74–83. Incidentally this case shows that non-episcopal ordination was not recognised.

⁴ For Athanasius’ prompt despatch of a deacon to find out Arsenius in his place of hiding, see *Apol. c. Ari.* 65. The abbot of the monastery where he had been concealed was brought before the general in command at Alexandria, and obliged to confess that he was alive.

cloak which concealed the face of Arsenius, he slowly unmuffles first one hand and then the other, and asks “where the third hand grew which he cut off.”¹ Or we find him intercepting Constantine in his ride with a resolute appeal for justice,² or walking with faithful fellow-exiles under the Roman walls of Treves. At Rome or at Milan, at Aquileia or at Sardica, at Cæsarea or at Antioch, he is always dignified, self-possessed, completely master of the situation. He attracts at once the admiration and the affection of the chief bishop of the West, himself a man of ability and energy. He comes home after six years, —his people make “a splendid festivity”³ of welcome; he takes pains to turn their gladness into the channel of practical piety, but guards, somewhat austere, against æsthetic excess in Church music, by reducing the

¹ Soc. i. 29.

² Ath. Apol. c. Ari. 86.

³ A phrase of Pope Julius I.’s: Apol. c. Ari. 52.

psalm-chant almost to a monotone.¹ He gives audience, in synod, to a layman who has used temporal power for the extension of the faith in Ethiopia, and sends him back as its missionary bishop.² Or, to take the most famous scene of all—

“ In the dark night, ‘mid the saints’ trial sore,”³

he and some of his people, assembled in a church for a vigil service, are beset by an armed force sent to arrest him ; he takes his seat calmly on his throne, orders the deacon beside him to read the 136th psalm, and the congregation to repeat the triumphant refrain, “ For His mercy endureth for ever,” and then quietly to disperse ; and he himself only just manages to escape the grasp of the soldiery.⁴

¹ Aug. Confess. x. 30.

² Soc. i, 19. Frumentius was afterwards commemorated in Ethiopia as “ Father of peace.”

³ Lyra Apostolica, p. 121.

⁴ Ath. Apol. de Fuga, 24, compared with the protest of the Alexandrian churchmen, inserted at the end of his Hist. Arianorum.

Or he is tending his flock from amid monastic hiding-places, as effectively as if he were still visible in Alexandria;¹ or he is baffling pursuers by an equivocal phrase and an instant change of his boat's course; or he is conferring with, and instructing, the first simply Catholic Emperor;² or he is avoiding the last of all his dangers by a timely concealment in a country house.³ One marvels that he lived through it all, came to nearly fourscore years, and died in his own bed, while Arians, who no longer ventured to molest him, were biding their time to drive out his successor.

So unquestionable is the power of such a life, that Gibbon himself, with just a word

¹ “En possession des cœurs et des esprits, ce fugitif, ce proscrit, du fond des solitudes où il se cache est, malgré ses ennemis conjurés, l'invisible maître de l'Égypte :” Fialon, St. Athanase, p. 177.

² Ep. to Jovian.

³ Chronicon Acephalum, 16. Socrates says, “in his father's tomb :” iv. 13.

or two of characteristic caveat about the “taint of fanaticism” in the mind of “the primate of Egypt,” does justice to his position as high among the great men of history; describes him as “patient of labour, jealous of fame”—that is, of his fair fame,—and “careless of safety;” and pronounces that “his superiority of character and abilities would have qualified him, far better than the degenerate sons of Constantine, for the government of a great monarchy:”¹ as if there were a certain irony in the fate which placed the liberty and security of an Athanasius at the disposal of a Constantius II. And so, in the perfect language of Dean Church, “Greeks saw their own nature and their own gifts elevated, corrected, transformed, glorified, in the heroic devotion of Athanasius, who, to all their familiar qualities of mind, brought a tenacity, a

¹ Gibbon, iii. 70.

soberness, a height and vastness of aim, an inflexibility of purpose, which they admired the more because they were just the powers in which the race failed.”¹

And yet, however much we may be fascinated by the brilliant or stormy pictures which succeed each other in this extraordinary career, however strongly it may appeal to our capacity of appreciating abilities so varied and a personality so majestic, we shall not really understand Athanasius unless we take full and serious account of the motive power of his activities and endurances, nor, one may add, unless the sympathy of a common belief can make us feel that it was well worth while for him so to do and so to suffer. What, then, was the enemy against which he waged a lifelong warfare?

Of Arianism a great authority has said that “never was a heresy stronger, more ver-

¹ *Gifts of Civilisation, etc.*, p. 249.

satile, more endowed with all the apparatus of controversy, more sure, as it might have seemed, of the future of the world." It "was a political force," and "a philosophical disputant."¹ If it had affinities to that Antiochene school which retained some impressions from "Samosatene" disbelief, it could also quote language in which Alexandrian divines had overstated the "Filial Subordination."² It appealed to those who were sensitively and actively watchful against a Sabellian confusion between the Son and the Father; it could even recommend itself to recent converts, who brought into the Christian area some notions derived from their abandoned polytheism; and its singular aptitude for utilising secular agencies and adopting irreligious methods is a fact not to be ignored in

¹ Liddon, Bamp. Lect. p. 446.

² Properly, *Subordinatio*—the position of the Son, as eternally derived from the Father, who is "of none." Athanasius, holding this, held also the Filial co-equality.

any estimate of its character. And what was its essential dogma? That the Son of God was not eternal, and not uncreated, but only the first of all the beings that had come into existence at the fiat of the One Most High;¹ the eldest of all, the most exalted of all, the instrument by which the others were created, but still, in the last analysis, one of them, "a thing made," "a work." Against this theory the Nicene Council, in its Creed as originally worded, had professed belief in "One Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father (as) only begotten, that is, from the essence of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, very God from very God, begotten, not made, of one essence with the Father;—Through whom all things, both things in heaven and things on earth, came into being; Who for us men, and for our salvation, came

¹ Athanasius sets forth the Arian propositions in *Orat. i.* 5, ad Ep. Aeg. 12, etc.

down and was incarnate, became man, suffered, and rose again the third day; ascended into the heavens, will come to judge the quick and dead."

As every one knows, the specially characteristic term in this formulary was "Homousion," Co-essential, less correctly rendered Consubstantial, or, as we say, "of one substance." It was open to various objections, arising out of notions which had been attached to the Greek word "ousia."⁴ But Athanasius long afterwards took pains to explain that

⁴ As *οὐσία* had been also used both for an individual and a species, and by Stoics for matter, some confusion was inevitable. Paul of Samosata had damaged the term "Homousion" by pretending that it implied a pre-existent essence, divided between the Father and the Son; and long after the Nicene Council it was associated in many minds either with the notion of a quasi-materialistic partition of the Divine Being, or of a Sabellian denial of the Son's distinct personality (see Hilary, *de Synod.* 68, 84, *Fragn.* ii. 2; Sozomen, ii. 18, iii. 18, vi. 7). Yet the great Alexandrians, who, before the Nicene Council, had withstood Sabellianism, whose language had given some occasion to Arianism, and to whom unspiritual conceptions of God were abhorrent, had adhered to the term: Newman, *Arians*, p. 198.

the Church used it as a safeguard of the idea of a proper Divine Sonship, such as implied that the Only-begotten was of the same nature with the Father, which would be impossible for any creature, however ancient and however august. It is not always remembered that the Homoousion did but compress into a single Greek word what lay in the phrase "very God of," or "from, very God;" for this phrase excluded the idea of an official, adoptive, or honorary sonship, and ascribed to the Only-begotten the same "reality" of Deity which was attributed to the Father from whom He was eternally derived.¹ And when Arianism was thoroughly examined, it was clear that at the root and core of it lay a denial of this unique Sonship, however much that fact might be obscured by expressions of deep reverence for the "divinity" of our Lord.²

¹ See Appendix I.

² Even the Sirmian "Blasphemia" applies the term "God" to the Son; and see Ath. ad Afros, 5.

When all was said, He remained still a Son by adoption and grace, not by nature.¹ What, then, were the issues raised by the discussion? How was religion interested in the case? Would the success of Arianism have been for Christian souls, for Christian life and thought, a matter of no significance; or would it have been a capital disaster?

1. There were three issues involved. To begin with what lay nearest to the surface: Christians had immemorially rendered to Christ the tribute of an absolute devotion. They had not merely looked up to Him as Master; they had worshipped Him as God.² He had been invested, in their belief, with an unqualified supremacy over the soul and

¹ Ath. de Synod. 54; Orat. i. 9, 37. "Arius begins by pressing the metaphor of Sonship, and works round to the conclusion that it is no proper Sonship at all;" Gwatkin, Studies of Arianism, p. 28. Cp. Newman's Arians, p. 213. With all its pretensions to be logical, Arianism resulted in incoherence.

² Liddon, Bamp. Lect. p. 367.

the life; had been loved, trusted, served, to all lengths,—adored as personally and literally Divine.¹ The question then was, whether this should go on; whether it was defensible, or whether Christians were to reconsider their position, and materially alter their way of thinking, feeling, and acting towards their Saviour. For if Arianism were true, this would become a religious duty for those who desired to keep the First Commandment. And so the “keen-visioned seer,” as Newman in another short poem calls Athanasius, threw himself ardently into the work of maintaining the Nicene Creed as a theological rationale of the Church’s devotion to her Lord—as an expression, and now (in the face of Arianism, which had shown at the Nicene Council its capacity of explaining

¹ “The real proof” of the Apostles’ belief in Christ’s divinity “lies in the absolute sovereignty in which Christ is enthroned over their moral and spiritual life:” Dale on the Atonement, p. 25.

away the simple terms of the New Testament) a specially opportune expression, of the belief that Christ had an entire right to all the loyalty, all the service, all the worship which His servants had rendered or could render,—a right consisting in the fact that He was “of and in” the supreme incommutable Essence;¹ that He was the Son by nature, God from God, and God with God; and, further, that only as being Himself uncreated could He discharge the functions of a Redeemer, or be the principle of spiritual life, restoration, and sanctification to fallen and sinful humanity. Thus, as the writer from whom I am largely borrowing has admirably worded it, “The question with St. Athanasius was the evangelical one, ‘What think ye of Christ?’ a question,” he adds, “practical, personal, moral, devotional, involving the very

¹ See Newman, *Arians*, p. 260; Liddon, *Bamp. Lect.* p. 447.

substance of Christian life and practice ;”¹ as Carlyle himself came to see that “if the Arians had won, Christianity would have dwindled into a legend.”

2. Next, we may observe that Arianism imperilled the strict, pure, definite conception of God, as immeasurably distinct from all creaturely life. Paganism, with its hierarchy of deities, had hopelessly corrupted the simplicity of the Divine idea ; and Arianism was a retrograde step towards Paganism, inasmuch as, while denying the Son to be uncreated and eternal—that is, while separating Him from the real Godhead—it ascribed to Him a titular divinity, and formally brought within the Christian sanctuary the

¹ Wace, in *Good Words* for 1878, p. 683, ff. It was the constant habit of Athanasius to take his stand on the existing traditional Christianity : see e.g. *Orat.* i. 8. According to him, if the *Homoousion* were a new term, it was but the expression of an old belief, an old worship, an old habitual devotion of soul. It was a case in which to be “conservative,” in the sense of objecting to a new term, was to risk being “destructive.”

heathenish principle of a plurality of gods. It said in effect, There is divinity—and divinity; there is primary worship and secondary worship; the Son of God, being the highest of creatures, is in this inferior, improper sense, “divine” and “adorable.” Athanasius, and the Catholic divines who followed him, instantly saw their advantage, and pushed the Arians hard with the charge of worshipping Christ on an idolatrous principle.¹ “On your showing,” they said, “you have no right to worship Christ; He is, in your view, a creature; if you want to worship Him, you must come up to our ground, and confess Him to be uncreate. As it is, you hold too much, if you do not hold too little. As it is, you are doing a mischief

¹ He struck, as De Broglie says, “incessamment sur ce point vulnérable de l’Arianisme. . . . En effet, l’identité parfaite de sa substance avec la substance divine était la seule chose qui distinguât le Christ de tous les demi-dieux . . . dont l’antiquité avait chargé ses autels :” L’Église et l’Empire, iii. 339.

to religion by obscuring the chasm that stretches between God and all beside, in virtue of which the highest archangel and the lowest thing that breathes are on a level before Him who upholds in life whatever He has created, as He could, by His mere will, sweep all creation back into nothingness." Herein they were doing much more than merely embarrassing their antagonists by an effective retort or a *reductio ad absurdum*. They were witnessing against an idolatrous conception, a profane "dilution of the idea of Deity:"¹ they were

¹ Mozley on the Theory of Development, p. 79. He had said, "Idolatry could not attach to the Arians' idea in its application; for, so far as our Lord was the object of their worship, they were not idolatrous. It attached to it in its substance; the position was in itself an idolatrous one; it supposed a being who was not to be supposed, . . . a being virtually a god to human minds, and yet an idol the instant he was a god. . . . It was a principle with the Fathers to dislike proximities to Deity. . . . Let creatures be creatures, and let God be God, their theology said," etc. The Arian worship of Christ "was on its own principles absolutely heathen creature-worship;" Gwatkin, Studies of Arianism,

decisively barring out the ditheism which was knocking for entrance,—were securing for all Christian generations the aboriginal truth that God is essentially One.

3. Thirdly, we may discern in this debate a revival of the question which the Gnostics of earlier days had raised. Was there not, they had practically asked, a real inaccessibleness in the Supreme, which would always keep Him aloof, out of contact with the world and with man? Must there not be interposed between Him and the world, between Him and man, the agency of powers below Himself, the lowest of which would *not* be degraded or defiled by entering into

p. 28. See Athan. ad. Ep. Aeg. 4; Orat. i. 8, ii. 23, iii. 16; de Syn. 50; ad Adelph. 3. This is the point of Basil's reply, when urged by Modestus to adopt Arianism: "I, being a creature of God, cannot endure to worship any creature;" Greg. Naz. Orat. 43. 48. So Augustine, in Joan. Evan. Tract. 18. 4: "The Word was God! 'Yes, I hold this,' says the Arian, 'but the one is the greater God, the other the lesser.' Well, but that savours of Paganism; I thought I was talking to a Christian!"

relations with matter and with humanity?¹ And now Arianism virtually suggested, in its theory of a created Son of God, what tended to bring the old Gnostic idea back again. Arius distinctly said, in a poetical and popular representation of his opinions, that the Son did not thoroughly know the Father.² The revelation, then, which took place through the Son, was not an adequate revelation of the Father; it was something less than that,—as much as could be given in the circumstances; the ultimate essential Deity had not shone forth, had not actually spoken. But the Catholic Creed, by declaring the Son to be co-essential, excluded this survival of a non-Christian philosophy. It said that the Father had spoken through the Son, that the Son had “interpreted” the

¹ See Bp. Lightfoot on *Colossians*, p. 78.

² The “*Thalia*,” quoted in *Ath. de Synod.* 15. It was a serious poem, although the metre adopted had associations which were anything but serious.

Father; that in Him, who, as Athanasius often puts it, was the Father's "genuine offspring" and "exact image," the Divine will and character were expressed, as only One who was Divine could express them; that in this rich and saving sense, the Name of the Father was "put upon" the believer in the Son, who, "in worshipping the manifested glory, was worshipping nothing less than the one and only glory,"¹ was beholding it, and nothing short of it or less than it, "in the face of" the Incarnate, who, remaining what He was, the Word and the Son, had assumed and "appropriated" our humanity.² And to speak thus of the Virgin-born Redeemer, who had walked the earth in human form, had embraced and blessed little children, had wept over a grave, had let a friend lean on His bosom, had agonised

¹ Church Quart. Review, xiii. 226.

² Ath. Orat. iii. 33. Cp. Cyril adv. Orient. 12.

in the garden, had died upon the cross,—this was to bring God, the High and Holy One Himself, really near to man, to affirm the possibility of actual communion between Him and His moral creatures,¹—to give full utterance to the assertion that He is Love.

A great cause will often “carry the fortunes” of more than one momentous principle; but one of those principles will be most habitually present to the consciousness of its advocates. In the case before us, the real Deity of the Saviour, with its boundless claim on human love, gratitude, and loyalty, was the idea which occupied the foreground in the minds of those who contended for the Homoousion; and a French historian of “the Church and the Empire” has described their acknowledged leader as “enkindled, from youth upward,

¹ Cp. Bishop Boyd Carpenter’s Bamp. Lect. p. 110; and Gwatkin, Studies of Arianism, p. 28.

with the passion which makes saints, the love of Jesus Christ," and as thus led to "consecrate all his faculties, the resources of his learning and his logic, under the guidance of an inflexible will and of eminent good sense, to the defence of the Incarnate Word."¹ It was for Him, rather than merely for the authority of a synod or the orthodoxy of a formula, that he so contended as to justify that terse majestic sentence in which Hooker condenses what might fill pages of eulogy, "Only in Athanasius there was nothing observed, throughout the course of that long tragedy, other than such as very well became a wise man to do, and a righteous to suffer."² No motive less penetrating and commanding than that of devotion to a personal Divine Christ would

¹ De Broglie, *L'Église et l'Empire*, i. 372. Cp. Basil, Ep. 82, to Athanasius as having "from his very boyhood been engaged in the contest on behalf of true religion."

² Hooker, E. P. v. 42. 5.

have made this career so unique as an example.

It may be interesting to glance briefly at some of the chief characteristics of Athanasius, as brought out in the work to which he thus devoted his whole being.

(1) We see, then, in him, to begin with, a man of warm sympathies, who draws the hearts of his people towards him, who never forfeits their affection and their confidence. The powers of his see are great, but, in Newman's words, he has "too much good sense and magnanimity . . . too much gentleness and large sympathy to abuse" them.¹ When he is in exile, his thoughts turn to his flock in Alexandria, or, rather, throughout Egypt; he is anxious that they should not lose hope, should not relax in fidelity to the cause. He is signally loyal to his old

¹ Historical Sketches, iii. 339. So Basil writes to him in 371, "Who has more sympathy (than you) with the afflictions of the brethren?" Ep. 66.

friends. One of these, in a one-sided zeal against Arianism, takes up a theory of the Sonship which appears to attach it to the Lord's humanity alone, and to ascribe to the Word, as such, an eternity which is not personal.¹ Athanasius, as long as he can, puts a favourable construction on questionable language in the treatise of Marcellus on 1 Cor. xv. 28; and when a younger prelate, with a keen scent for heterodoxy, tries to sound him on this delicate point, he checks the inquiry by silence—and a smile,² although, according to another writer,³ he at one

¹ See Hefele, *Councils*, E. T. ii. 31. If Marcellus really maintained this, his object probably was to deprive the Arians of their favourite argument from the word Son. But the Sardican Council, having examined the book (from which we only possess extracts made by an adversary, Eusebius the historian), acquitted Marcellus. Pope Julius had been satisfied by a profession of faith which, at his request, Marcellus drew up. See *Apol. c. Ari.* 32, 47.

² Epiphanius, *Hær.* 72. 4.

³ Hilary, *Fragm.* ii. 21-23. Hilary supposes that this was on account of some later utterances of Marcellus: which might lead one to suppose that the Sardican Council had put

time suspended communion with Marcellus. Another friend undeniably goes astray from a similar cause, and says that the Word was to Christ instead of a mind, while his followers proceed to deny the human reality of Christ's body. Athanasius feels bound to write against this error; but although he denounces it as a virtual attack on the human side of the Incarnation,¹ he will not mention Apollinaris by name.

(2) Again, we see in him a signal instance of the consecration of practical ability. Although, as a promising youth, he was taken into his archbishop's household, and trained under distinctly ecclesiastical influences, he grows up a man of his own time, with eyes open to all around him, with a memory full of images from everyday life,² too favourable a construction on his treatise. Yet Hilary seems to agree with the Council.

¹ See *Later Treatises of St. Ath.* in the Library of the Fathers, p. 79, ff.

² Thus, in the "Contra Gentes" and the "De Incarna-

and with business faculties of a very high order. He exhibits what has been truly called “a singular and piercing knowledge of human nature.” It has been finely said that “his life is a work carried through with an object perfectly well defined, towards which his efforts, his acts, and his writings, which are themselves acts, tend without pause and without deviation; the steadfastness of this soul, independent and mistress of itself, is a living proof of the free will and the moral force of man.”¹ He is never taken

tione Verbi,” we have imagery drawn from chariot races, from wrestlers, from musical instruments, from the “restoration” of effaced portraits, from a well-ordered city, from the blaze of full sunshine, from the multitudinous waves which he must have watched from the port of Alexandria. He shows also a strong sense of the interdependence of diverse elements in the physical world. This lively facility in illustration appears, *e.g.*, in *Orat. ii.* 52, *iii.* 79.

¹ Fialon, *St. Athanase*, p. 299. Cp. *Basil*, Ep. 66: “Who has a keener perception of what should be done? who has more practical ability for carrying out what is beneficial?” In Ep. 69, he has recourse to Athanasius as “both an adviser and a leader in action;” in Ep. 82, he addresses him as a divinely appointed “physician of the

off his guard ; he has a resource for every difficulty ; he is keen and prompt to utilise every opportunity. He knows how to manage men ; the right word, sometimes an opportunely humorous word, comes naturally to his lips ; he is at home in all the intricacies of what may be called party organisation, as well as in the ordinary details of the administration of diocese or patriarchate ; in short, he stands out among those comparatively few saints who have been conspicuous as ecclesiastical statesmen.

(3) Cardinal Newman has dwelt with justice on the combination and balance of qualities, "the union of firmness with discrimination," of unswerving adhesion to principles with equitable consideration for individuals, which indicated in Athanasius a "completeness of character" that was lacking

diseases under which the Churches suffer," as the "competent pilot" of the labouring vessel.

to some other “conspicuous champions” of “orthodoxy;”¹ or, as one might prefer to say,—for the term “orthodoxy” may sound, to some ears, hard and formal, and is, after all, inadequate to represent the idea intended,—of the faith in a really Divine Christ. No side of his character is developed to the prejudice of another; he is mature, equable, tranquilly strong.

It is not required by historical justice that we should seriously qualify this estimate by reference to the vituperative epithets² which Athanasius, after the controversial fashion of his age, applied to an heretical party which, as he knew from bitter experience, never scrupled to fight with the most carnal

¹ Newman, *Arians*, p. 367. We may illustrate this “manliness” by his frank acknowledgment of having been led to inquire into and ascertain the use of a term: *de Synod.* 46; *Orat.* i. 30.

² See Newman, *Ath. Treatises*, ii. 341 (Lib. Fath.). It should be added that Athanasius accepted, without verifying, the received ecclesiastical opinion about Meletius, which appears to have been incorrect. Cp. Hefele, i. 346.

weapons of this world, or to the petty-minded autocrat who had made himself its agent, and from whom he had hoped against hope for something like fair treatment, and something like respect for a plighted word.¹ Phrases of irrepressible scorn and indignation do not modify the impression which we derive from the generous tone and measured language in which Athanasius alludes to Liberius, who had been wearied or cajoled into disowning him as having justly incurred deposition,² or

¹ “The *Apologia ad Constantium*,” which has been called hypocritical in its expressions of trustful respect, was written in 356, for use in a possible contingency—if Constantius should change his line, and admit Athanasius to an audience instead of continuing to persecute him. Similarly the Letter to Egyptian Bishops, written early in 356, uses conventional terms of respect towards Constantius. See the writer’s Introduction to Athanasius’ Historical Writings, p. lxiii. The “*Apologia de Fuga*,” which calls Constantius a heretic, was written when this change was past hoping for. The “*Historia Arianorum*” was written about the beginning of 358, and, in part at least, by a secretary; in it Constantius is unsparingly denounced.

² Ath. *Apol.* 88; *Hist. Ari.* 41. He does not refer to Liberius’ acceptance of an uncatholic formulare; we learn this from other evidence, that of Hilary, Jerome, and Sozo-

to Hosius, who in extreme old age had been, one might almost say, coerced by brutal ill-treatment into the temporary acceptance of a thoroughly Arian creed.¹ He who himself was ever the same, who, had he fallen into the hands of Constantius, or of the instruments of that Emperor's odious tyranny, would have died rather than compromise his faithfulness, can make every allowance for the weakness, under this or that trial, of men whose hearts he believes to be "right with" his own. He can plead with others who honestly imagine themselves to have found, in the formula "Like in Essence," the exact *via media* between "Co-essential" and simply "Like,"² not to speak of the ultra-Arian men. What he says that Liberius "signed" was a document renouncing communion with him.

¹ The "Blaspemia," commonly called the Second Sirmian. It is in Ath. de Synod. 28, and Soc. ii. 30.

² "Like," the "Homoion" of the "Acacian" Arians, represented a wish to get rid of human formulas, and at the same time, being easily understood to mean a merely moral likeness of the Son to the Father, such as might, in degree,

term “Unlike ;” but whom he entreats, as his “brothers,” to consider whether they have not gravely misunderstood the term “Co-essential,”—whether, believing already, as he trusts, in the proper reality of the Divine Sonship, they will not be consistent in accepting a term which, rightly taken, means neither less nor more.¹

Once again, look at him as he presides in an Alexandrian Council, which might well serve as a pattern for Church synods. It is a breathing-time after a long persecution. Two sections of Catholics have mutually offended each other by the diverse employment of an ambiguous term. Some say, as the Nicene Council had implicitly said,² that there is one “hypostasis,” or

be predicated of any holy creature, it served as an introduction to the ultra-Arian “Anomoion.”

¹ *De Synod.* c. 41. In c. 54 he pleads, “Let us not fight with shadows.” In *Orat. i.* 21, he implies that *Homoïousion* may have a sound sense.

² In the anathema appended to the original Nicene

literally “subsistence,” in the Godhead ; others rejoin, “No, there are three.” The former are charged with “confounding the Persons ;” the latter are accused of “dividing the Substance.” Just when it is so unspeakably important for Churchmen to present an unbroken front to the common enemy, a breach appears to be imminent ; but Athanasius steps between.¹ He sees that the first thing to be done is to ascertain whether the difference is verbal or real. He asks each of the dissentient parties what sense they attach to the word. It turns out, as he had expected, that those who speak of “one hypostasis” mean “one nature, one essence, one Godhead ;” they are resolute in Creed, against those “who said that the Son of God was . . . of a different hypostasis or essence.” Yet Athanasius, long before this Alexandrian Council, had admitted the phrase, “three hypostases,” provided they were not regarded as “separate,” as in the case of human personalities : In illud, *Omnia mihi*, 6 ; *Expos. Fid.* 2. On his Trinitarian theology, see Appendix I.

¹ See S. Greg. Naz. *Orat.* 21. 35.

barring out Arianism, but have no thought of merging the personality of the Son and the Holy Spirit in that of the Father. Those who affirm "three hypostases" explain that they intend thereby to say, "There is a real Father, a real Son, a real Holy Spirit;" they are bent on excluding Sabellianism, but repudiate utterly the notion of dissolving what later theology has called the Coinherence, of imagining a Trinity of separate beings, of saying in effect, "There are three Gods or three Lords."¹ Thus, to use the familiar wording of the "Quicunque," what is "required by the Christian verity" is secured, while what is "forbidden by the Catholic

¹ "The word subsistence, *ὑπόστασις*, which expresses the one Divine substance," or God's real being, "has been found more appropriate to express that substance viewed personally." Newman, Ath. Treat. ii. 424 (Lib. Fath.). Of course, to speak of "Persons" in the Holy Trinity is only "an approximation to the truth" (MacColl, Christianity in Relation to Science and Morals, p. 78), which requires the idea of "circumcessio" or coinherence, as its safeguard against Tritheism: see Newman, Arians, p. 178.

religion" is shut out: all agree in "worshipping one God," but that God as existing "in a Trinity." The "Quicunque," as we all know, is of Latin origin, and of later date; but its careful insistence on both sides of Trinitarian doctrine could not be more vividly illustrated than by the conduct, on this memorable occasion, of the great teacher whose name it popularly bears, and who, not for the only time, taught theological students the invaluable lesson of looking through words into ideas,¹ and refusing to recognise a difference of belief on the mere evidence of a difference of terminology.

(4) In connection with this point, we may notice one eminently characteristic feature in the theological writings of Athanasius. It is his power of seeing both aspects of a truth.² Some of the great divines of anti-

¹ See Stanley on the Eastern Church, p. 300.

² "Sans rien innover," says Fialon, "he gave precise

quity are open to the charge of a certain onesidedness: they are called upon to emphasise a particular doctrine, and they do so; but in doing so they sometimes appear to put into the background another doctrine which is needed as its complement. Not thus did Athanasius proceed in his vindication of the "Homoousion." If his main subject is the Divinity of the Son, he is zealous against that offshoot of Arianism which regarded the Holy Spirit as a creature, and careful to assert that priority of order which belongs to the Father as the "fountain of Godhead."¹ He is keenly alive, as we have seen, to the necessity of recognising both aspects of the Incarnation.² It was his

expression to the Church's belief as between the Arian and the Sabellian extremes :" St. Athanase, p. 301.

¹ The "Monarchia," which Cardinal Newman, in his "Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical," calls the "principatus" of the Father, in allusion to the sense of "principium" as = *ἀρχή* = origin.

² A passage in the unfinished notes, or memoranda, called his Fourth Discourse against the Arians, may appear

special mission to maintain that what had dwelt in the tabernacle of the humanity was—

“God’s presence and His very Self,
And essence all Divine.”

But, he adds in effect, the Eternal Son of the Father took our own manhood upon Him ; and we must not slur over the reality of that immense condescension, as if His flesh or His mind were not veritably human, though immaculate and sinless : He is Very God, who became for our sakes Very Man ; or, in language borrowed by the compiler of the “Quicunque,” He is “perfect God and perfect man,” the self-same God and man.¹ Again, some passages in the Third Oration, or Discourse, against the Arians,² display an almost

defective in this point of view : Orat. iv. 6. But it is exceptional. See Orat. i. 50. He is fond of the phrase, “The Son’s presence as incarnate.”

¹ C. Apollin. i. 16. Comp. Orat. iii. 41.

² Orat. iii. 29, ff. ; comp. ad Maxim. 3. In Orat. iii. 43, 58 ; iv. 36, he implies that our Lord had a “human nature.”

prophetic discernment of the requirements of later controversy. Athanasius is urging that "the account of the Saviour given in Holy Scripture is twofold;" and what follows, through a somewhat long context, reads like an anticipation of the combined teaching which might be drawn from Cyril of Alexandria and from Leo the Great, although, naturally enough, the phrases employed are less technical.¹ In fact, few divines have been less enslaved to technicalism than Athanasius. Words are his servants, not his masters. He grasps a manifold doctrinal idea in itself, discerns its drift and scope, handles it with confident steadiness, does not mind repeating what he has said about it,² is characteristically versatile in suggesting this or that mode of enforcing or of illustrating it,³ and, as Keble long ago remarked, is

¹ See Appendix II.

² *E.g.* Orat. ii. 22, 80.

³ *E.g.* Orat. ii. 13.

happiest and richest when tracing it through the area of Scripture, with an “entire preparation of heart to follow whithersoever Scripture shall lead.”¹

(5) Again, Athanasius must be thought of as a practical religious teacher, who knew how to warn his flock against moral temptations. They must not, like many, profess to keep Lent while “they do evil to their brethren, or dare to defraud.” “Humble-ness of mind, lowly endurance of humiliations, acknowledgment of God, loving Him with all our soul and strength, and our neighbours as ourselves;” “imitation of the example of Christ;” “correspondence between the will and God’s grace, lest, if the will remains idle, the grace given us should depart;” “zeal, carefulness, fervour in the Lord’s service;” “thankfulness after relief

¹ Keble, *Sermons Academical and Occasional*, p. 406; so Gwatkin, p. 44. And see the long discussion of Arian interpretations of texts in the “*Orations*.”

from trial ;" " combination of godly living with sound belief ;"—these are attainments insisted on in his " Festal Letters," which may thus give some idea of his ordinary episcopal preaching.¹

(6) But, to bring our survey to an end. The gift, let us rather say the grace, of religious patience appears as signally developed in one who was not only persecuted by the enemies of the Catholic cause, but also continuously tried by the postponement of his hopes for its success. He saw the clouds repeatedly returning after the rain ; the bright visions which, as his noble book " on the Incarnation " indicates, had made him, in early manhood, anticipate a speedy and complete victory for the Faith,² must

¹ See Appendix III.

² The " De Incarnatione Verbi " is remarkable for the combination of this youthful glow of exultant confidence with ripeness of theological thought on so high a theme as the restoration of fallen humanity through union with the Incarnate Word. See c. 46, 53, 55.

have been soon overclouded by fresh evidence of the tenacious vitality of a misbelief which might have seemed to be crushed by the Nicene Council, and of the persistency of prejudices against the characteristic term of the Nicene Creed. To this discipline his spirit would be subjected through the forty years that then lay before him; and there were times when, in Hooker's words,¹ which have been condensed into a proverb, he seemed to stand alone "against the world." But he never lost heart; for to lose heart, he knew, was to lose faith,—and to lose faith was to lose all. "If brothers leave us," he once wrote, "and friends stand off, and none are found to suffer with us and to cheer us, still one thing suffices above all, recourse to God."² His feeling evidently was, Nothing pays in the end like faithfulness. In his own words, "Though affliction may come, it will

¹ E. P. v. 42, 5.

² Hist. Ari. 47.

have an end : what can be compared to the Kingdom? what is like to everlasting life?"¹ Apparent failures of the cause are no stumbling blocks to him ; he rises above the temptation under which many of God's servants have for a time given way, like Elijah in the wilderness ; his immovable faith makes even despondency impossible ; he can say, when Julian banishes him, "This little cloud will quickly pass." What he wrote from Treves to his flock in the tenth of his "Festal Epistles," represents the habitual conviction of a soul strong in proportion to its loyalty.² "O my beloved and dearest, we ought not to be saddened by temporary adversities ; we ought not to be frightened because the world is at enmity with God. Rather let us take pains to please God under these trials, which should be regarded as a test of virtue. . . . Our Lord and Saviour had worse to

¹ Fest. Ep. 13. ² Fest. Ep. 10. See Appendix IV.

bear. . . . If any one of us will conform to this example, beyond doubt we shall tread on serpents and vipers, and on all the forces of the enemy. . . . The enemy fights against us by trials and distresses, doing all he can to overwhelm us; but the man who, by Christ's aid, prepares himself to resist . . . will in the end be victorious, and will say, 'I can do all things through Christ that strengtheneth me.' This is the grace of the Lord; this is the Lord's teaching to men."

So wrote Athanasius in 338. And when his last hour had come, on Wednesday, the 2nd of May, 373, those who watched beside their dying "father and master" might well look back across that long interval with a fresh appreciation of the Apostolic assurance, that faith in Jesus as the Son of God "is the victory that overcometh the world." And we who, in a distant and widely different age, endeavour to gather up the teach-

ing of such a life, may enter into the prayer which, according to the “use” of Paris, was formerly offered on the anniversary of his departure, that “as he had maintained the excellency of the Divine Word,” so those who held him in festal remembrance “might be able worthily to understand the same, and also truthfully to confess it.” And truthfully to confess it is to live, as he lived, in its power.

ST. CHRYSOSTOM.

THE interest attaching to the life of St. Chrysostom is very different from that which is sustained throughout the stages of the Athanasian story. It is a more personal interest, because we know more of the inward man himself; and it is a much more simply moral interest, although a particular theological controversy bears some relation to the catastrophe of the narrative. The element of struggle and suffering is concentrated in the latter part of what may be called a drama, deepening by regular gradation towards a close which is, humanly speaking, tragical, and which, when looked at from the religious standpoint, is among the events which draw on men's faith for

relief from the shock of seeing right prostrate under wrong.¹ In this unique career, we find rich natural gifts, and a character full of spiritual beauty, associated with the glory of an unrivalled preacher and the brighter crown of a sufferer for righteousness. It is impossible to think of the John whose name has been lost in the epithet of “the Golden-mouthed,” without recognising in his character and in his trials a signal specimen of the “greater works” of Divine grace, and a signal fulfilment of the Divine assurance that cross-bearing is a condition of true victory.

Born at Antioch, about 345–347, the son of a military officer of high rank, and of a pious mother, who had the care of him ever since, as an infant, he lost his father,²

¹ See Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xi. 177 ; “un spectacle bien terrible à des yeux humains, mais bien grand et bien glorieux à des yeux chrétiens et spirituels.”

² Chrys. de Sacerd. i. 5. Her name was Anthusa.

John was, for some reason,—perhaps in mere conformity to a practice against which great Fathers, and he himself as a bishop, protested with partial success,—allowed to grow up unbaptised. He was not intended for a clerical life; the Antiochene bar was to be his future, and, as a youth, he became one of the most promising pupils of the great Pagan professor of literature who had been on intimate terms with Julian.¹ Rhetorical power was early developed in Chrysostom, and Libanius formed a high opinion of his probable success in that line.² He might have become a “leading barrister;” but his soul, even at that age, aspired to a higher sphere of activity in the kingdom that was not of this world. He placed himself under the training of Meletius, bishop

¹ Palladius, his biographer, expresses this by saying that at eighteen “he shook himself free from the professors of phrasemaking:” Dial. p. 40.

² Sozomen, viii. 2.

of Antioch, was baptised,¹ and admitted into the minor order of Readers ; and although, in compliance with his mother's entreaty,² he gave up his own plan of living with his like-minded friend Basil, in a sort of monastic seclusion, he carried out his ascetic ideal at home to an extent which implied some degree of overstrained enthusiasm, as if all life not thus exceptionally disciplined belonged, in St. John's sense, to "the world."

The last Arian persecution began, and it was probably just before the arrival of the Emperor Valens at Antioch, in the spring of 372, that the resolution was taken to fill some vacant bishoprics ; and Chrysostom and his friend Basil, notwithstanding their youth, were spoken of as well qualified for such a charge. Basil begged "that they might

¹ Palladius says that, after his baptism, no one ever heard him swear or curse, speak against a person, tell a falsehood, or tolerate unseemly jesting (*εὐτραπέλων*, ep. Eph. v. 4) : p. 183.

² *De Sacerd.* i. 5.

act in concert; Chrysostom affected to consent,"¹ but when the moment came, he was not to be found; and Basil, being assured that Chrysostom had accepted election to one see, was induced to do the like in regard to another, probably that of Raphanea, near Antioch. But it was a *ruse* on Chrysostom's part; he honestly believed that it would be good for the Church that Basil should become a bishop, and at the same time that he himself should *not*;² and as he did not hesitate about using artifice to secure this twofold object, and "laughed with delight"³ when it had been attained, so the great drawback to our enjoyment of his beautiful treatise "on the Priesthood," written probably some twelve years later, and cast into the form of a dialogue between himself and Basil, consists in an elaborate

¹ Stephens, *Life of St. Chrysostom*, p. 41, to which the reader is referred for fuller information.

² *De Sacerd.* ii. 6.

³ *De Sacerd.* i. 6.

justification of the principle that "deceit" for a religious or otherwise good end is a justifiable piece of "management."¹ One has to learn lessons from the mistakes of saints, as well as from their excellences; but it is sad to find a saint so "loveable"² deliberately vindicating a theory, itself the product of a non-Christian laxity, which was to act so disastrously on the Christian sense of truth. It is some relief to remember that what were afterwards called "pious frauds" incurred the indignant repudiation of St. Augustine.³

Chrysostom's evasion of episcopal responsibilities was, however, overruled for the

¹ *De Sacerd.* i. 9. The euphemistic use of the word *oikonomia* might illustrate what South, in a powerful sermon, describes as "the fatal imposture and force of words." Chrysostom erroneously assumes that St. Paul in this sense deceived the Judaisers when he circumcised Timothy.

² Stephens, *Life of Chrysostom*, p. 430.

³ *Aug. Epist. 40.* His words might seem prophetic: "Non enim potest aut oportet litteris explicari, quanta et quam inexplicabilia mala consequantur si *hoc* concesserimus," *i.e.* that Scripture sanctions untruthfulness.

lasting benefit of the Church. We should all have been losers if he had spent his life in some obscure diocese of North Syria. For about six years he actually lived in monastic retirement, and carried his ascetic enthusiasm to a point at which health broke down. He was obliged to return to Antioch, and was ordained deacon by Meletius in 381, and priest by his successor Flavian in 386. This second ordination¹ inaugurated his ministry as the "popular preacher" of Antioch during nearly twelve years. We know, from his treatise on the Priesthood, how deeply he felt the responsibilities of this task, and how much pains he deemed necessary for its discharge.² The

¹ In the sermon which he then delivered, he describes himself as "a mere youth of no account," but as conscious that he had a reputation for eloquence; and begs his distinguished audience to relieve his anxiety by prayers to Him who "gives utterance to those who preach the Gospel." The style is much too florid for our taste; it exhibits the result of Libanius' example.

² See Appendix V.

chief incident of his life during this period was the affair of the Imperial statues, which were insulted by the Antiochene populace in a short but furious tumult. Then ensued an agonising panic: what would the Emperor do, or what would he *not* do, in requital of such an outrage? During the suspense, and while instalments of judicial vengeance were bringing misery into families,¹ Chrysostom “redeemed the occasion” by preaching to the people against their besetting faults or sins, especially against that of “binding themselves by rash oaths.”² In these sermons he exhibits his intense reality as a moral guide, as a preacher of vital and practical Christianity;³ he takes all possible

¹ Hom. ad Pop. Antioch. 3. 1, 2.

² Stephens, p. 159. It was not simple profaneness; they swore to do this or that, however trifling, and then held themselves bound to do it. Cp. Hom. ad Pop. Ant. 5. 7; 7. 5; 8. 4; 15. 5.

³ Church-going and fasting, he urges, are profitable *if* they tell on conduct: ib. 3. 5; 5. 7; 20. 1.

pains to turn the anxiety and terror to religious advantage ; the melancholy silence in the streets¹ is treated as a call to prayer, and to a profitable use of the Lenten season ; the crowded church, in contrast with the deserted forum, is a hopeful sight to the preacher who sees his way to making a real impression on many souls. And when, at last, Theodosius yields to Flavian's intercession, and pardons the birthplace of the Christian name, Chrysostom concludes his course of sermons in a strain highly characteristic : he urges the people to show their joy by the " radiance of good works," and by thanking God " not only that He had freed them from the recent calamity, but that He had permitted it to occur."²

His chief expository discourses belong to this period of his life. As a commentator on Scripture, he dwelt, for the most part,

¹ Stephens, p. 155. ² Hom. ad Pop. Ant. 21. 4.

on the literal sense, as the matter to be first ascertained.¹ Spiritual interpretation has undoubtedly a real sanction in Scripture, and a true relation to the vast and manifold unities which belong to a Divine economy as completed in the Fulfiller of prophecy and type ; but, if handled without good sense and self-restraint, it is only too certain to run wild.² Chrysostom, therefore, as the best specimen of the Syrian school of exegesis, did great service by subordinating³ allegorism to the primary necessity of settling what words meant. Akin to this merit is the clearness with which he repeatedly marks the line between errors on both sides in regard to the Trinity and the Incarnation. Another excellent feature of

¹ He refers to this trouble when preaching at Constantinople, in Col. Hom. 7. 3, where it appears that the elder city was jealous of the younger.

² See Liddon, Univ. Serm. ii. 168 ; Bigg, Bamp. Lect. p. 146 ff.

³ See Stephens, p. 423.

his work is the delicate sympathetic insight with which he traces the connection of thoughts and arguments in such a writer as his beloved St. Paul ; and a fourth, from the standpoint of a preacher, is the persistency with which he keeps before his hearers the obligation of bringing the study of Scripture to bear effectively on daily conduct.

We must now pass on to the year 397. The see of Constantinople is vacant by the death of its bishop, Nectarius, and becomes at once the object of many ambitious longings, and of not a few scandalous intrigues. To rank, in Eastern eyes,¹ next after the bishop of "Old Rome,"—to be an Emperor's own pastor,—to have opportunities of exercising influence, though not, as yet, patriarchal power, over numerous ecclesiastical provinces,—to preside over a distinguished

¹ "Eastern" is here used not as inclusive of "Egyptian."

body of clergy, and to have at command the pomp and splendour of an august official position,—to inhabit a palace furnished like a senator's, and to entertain the great men of the great city with a hospitality, so called, that could match their own,—this was a prospect all too fascinating for clerics whose tone of mind had been secularised and debased.¹

And now observe a remarkable ordering of events. These hopes were baffled by the Emperor's all-powerful chamberlain, Eutropius, himself a man of low character, but not incapable of appreciating the high-souled preacher whose acquaintance he had formerly made. At his prompting, Arcadius appointed Chrysostom to the bishopric; under his menacing, imperious pressure, the

¹ Palladius, p. 42. “Men who were no men, presbyters in dignity, but unworthy of the priesthood, some besetting the palace gate, others offering bribes, others crawling before the people.”

consecration was performed by Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, who had hoped to obtain the preferment for one of his own clergy, and was ere long to be the chief persecutor of the man on whom he thus reluctantly laid hands. Through this strange instrumentality the episcopate of Chrysostom began on the 26th of February, 398.

His first sermon to his new flock was directed against the ultra-Arians,¹ and dwelt on that “incomprehensibleness” of the Divine nature which they explicitly denied. He began the next by saying, “I have only addressed you on one day, and from that day I have loved you as much as if I had been bred up among you,”² an outburst of

¹ He had preached at Antioch on the same subject. The “Anomoeans,” under the leadership of Eunomius, went beyond the original Arianism by denying any mystery in the Divine nature. In his first sermon against them he had urged that if God’s judgments were “unsearchable” and therefore “incomprehensible,” much more was this true of God Himself (see Appendix VI.).

² C. Anomoeos, Hom. xi. 11. In this sermon he urges

the pastoral tenderness which, says Tillemont, "is found often, or rather everywhere, in his homilies,"¹ although, on this special occasion, the welcome which he had received might call forth an exuberant response. We must indeed remember, in estimating his aptitude for this work, that he would not have been the preacher he was, had not his natural and cultivated gift of eloquence been at once the ally and the instrument of a very hopeful temper, a very firm will, and a very warm and "sensitive heart;"² and if all these husbands and wives to come to church together, and bring their children with them.

¹ Tillemont, xi. 111. But he was not afraid to magnify his office. "So long as we sit on this throne, so long as we hold this prelacy, we have both the dignity and the power, even though we are unworthy. . . . We are God's ambassadors: if this offends you, it is not we, but the episcopate; not So-and-so, but the bishop." In Col. Hom. 3. 4. He sometimes spoke from the throne, but oftener, in order to be the better heard, from the reader's desk in the body of the church. He usually preached once a week at least.

² Newman, Hist. Sketches, iii. 234. He had said just before that the "distinctive praise" of Chrysostom's oratory was that it was natural. "He spoke because his heart, his head, were brimful of things to speak about."

endowments had not been transfigured and intensified by a vivid consciousness of the objects of faith, and by the living fire of a supernatural charity. In other words, his oratorical power (which, of course, must be judged by a Greek rather than by an English standard) was combined with the three great gifts of a great preacher in all times and countries—the sympathy which can move and lift the hearers, the insight into spiritual facts which can present them as luminous realities, and the enthusiasm for a sacred cause which can fire the soul with a congenial devotion. Truly may it be said that the persuasive energy which carried his words home was the fruit and the token of convictions which could see by the light of the Christian creed the capacities and the destiny of man as a believer. Of him Sozomen might well say, as Bede says of more than one saint in the first age of

English Christianity, that he recommended his teaching by the consistency of his life, so that "his words were embellished by his deeds."¹ Whether as preacher or as Church ruler, Chrysostom drew his strength from the twofold, or rather, the single source of devotion to Christ and solicitude for Christian men.

He had difficulties from the outset. He was, indeed, to a considerable extent, prepared for them: he knew that the pastoral office, wherever exercised, was a searching test of character; that he must be ready to treat different classes of his flock with a patient discrimination, to meet unreasonable complaints with equanimity, and to confute slanders which he might be tempted to despise.² And he soon found that the people entrusted to him had as much of

¹ Sozomen, viii. 2. On the need of conduct consistent with belief, see In Act. Hom. 47. 4.

² See Appendix VII.

the Greek levity as those who had hung on his words in the “Golden Church” of Antioch. Though impressive and enthusiastic, they were fitful and unstable, and often sadly deficient in ordinary seriousness and reverence. With all their real affection and admiration for one whose splendid powers, as they well knew, were expended on their truest interests, and whose plain-spoken censures they could take in a good spirit, they grieved him repeatedly by their incurable frivolity, their passion for public amusements,¹ their frequent inattention during the services,² their neglect of Holy Communion,³ their indifference to the study

¹ See the sermon “Contra Ludos,” preached on the Easter Day of 399, after the people had spent Good Friday in applauding charioteers, and Easter Eve in witnessing a vicious dramatic performance. That the theatre was grossly demoralising, see in 1 Thessal. Hom. 5. 4.

² In Heb. Hom. 8. 14; 15. 4. In Act. Hom. 24. 4, he describes them as laughing aloud, or joking with each other, during the prayers, or even talking while the priest is consecrating the elements.

³ Many “partook of the Sacrifice” only once a year, others twice. In Heb. Hom. 17. 4.

of Scripture,¹ their childish forgetfulness of rudimentary Christian teaching.² Chrysostom looked about him, and saw vulgar pride of wealth, tasteless and senseless luxury,³ large incomes ignobly squandered, heathenish habits retained at marriages and funerals,⁴ a superstitious reliance on amulets, or spells,

¹ "Your boys," he says, "think that to know a psalm is something to be ashamed of:" in Col. Hom. 9. 2, and a little before, "Procure at least the *New Testament*. . . . This is the cause of all evils,—the not knowing the Scriptures." See the opening of his Homilies on the Acts: "Many," he says, "did not know that there was such a book in Scripture."

² In Col. 1. c.

³ He must have been disgusted at the display of gold on every article of dress or of furniture in rich men's houses, the massive bowls and tables, and (see *Synesius de Regno*) the excessive amount of jewellery, the trains of Scythian slaves acting as cup-bearers, table-deckers, litter-carriers, etc. Cp. in Col. Hom. 1. 4.

⁴ He did not object to marriage feasts or nuptial dresses, but to the introduction of dances from the stage: in Col. Hom. 12. 4. He felt "shame" that wild lamentations made by hired female mourners in funeral trains passing along the forum should make the profession of Christian hope contemptible in the eyes of unbelievers: in Heb. Hom. 4. 5. There was a strong body of Pagans in Constantinople, who formed a society of their own: in 1 Thessal. Hom. 2. 4.

or divinations,¹ and a pestilent abundance of sins of the tongue.² He met with some who professed Christianity, but dallied with Pagan objections on such points as the spiritual condition of the heathen,³ or the comparatively lateness of the Advent,⁴ or the future resurrection,⁵ or “eternal judgment;”⁶ and although, in one memorable sentence,⁷ he acknowledges the compatibility of some doubts with belief, and would treat Pagan “difficulties” with seriousness,⁸ he

¹ In 1 Thess. Hom. 3. 5, in Col. Hom. 8. 5.

² On swearing, see in Act. Hom. 8. 3. Some carped bitterly at a priest if he wore a cleaner cloak than usual, or had enough of necessary food: in Phil. Hom. 9. 4.

³ In Col. Hom. 2. 6.

⁴ Ib. 4. 3.

⁵ In 1 Thess. Hom. 7. 2.

⁶ Ib. 8. 2. Scripture warnings about hell were treated by some as “bruta fulmina;” others thought that hell would be temporary. In 2 Thess. Hom. 3. 1.

⁷ In Heb. Hom. 19. 1: ἐστι γὰρ καὶ πιστεύειν διστάζοντα. This commentary was expanded from notes, but such a clause seems literally genuine.

⁸ In Act. Hom. 33. 4, he describes a Pagan inquirer as puzzled by Christian dissensions. We refer him (he says in effect) to Scripture as a test. He rejoins, “All sects claim Scripture: how am I to decide?” If he had to learn medicine

strove earnestly to lead such Christian hearers on to an entireness of faith, discouraging the discussion of insoluble questions,¹ and dwelling on such matters as the responsibility for free will,² the possibility of real conversion, the immense forgivingness of God,³ the blessedness of His service, the terrors of Doomsday, the hopelessness of perdition.⁴ He was eminently a preacher of holy love, but of love in union with holy

or make a purchase, he must examine and discriminate. So it is here. By doing what he knows to be right, he will get light, etc.

¹ See in Col. Hom. 5. 3, on the questions that might be raised about God's nature. Cp. De Sacerd. iv. 5: "Others demand of God an account of His judgments, and press forward to sound that great deep: while only a few are interested about faith and conduct, the majority are curious about things which it is impossible to find out, and to inquire into which is to provoke God. And if a man exerts authority to silence those who are prying into these inscrutable matters, he is considered haughty and ignorant," etc.

² See Appendix VIII.

³ In Phil. Hom. 11. 5, "When we have a Father so tender, so eagerly desirous of our return."

⁴ Once he was so much agitated by describing the "Dies iræ" as to be obliged to break off. In Phil. Hom. 13. 4.

fear. And if his expository sermons delivered at Constantinople have been thought "less finished" than those which he had preached at Antioch¹ (as may well have been the case, considering the manifoldness of his episcopal work), he adhered in them to his old practice of insisting on such tests of the vitality of belief as prayer, Scripture reading, almsgiving, patience under trial, habitual thankfulness, purity of heart and conduct, self-control in speech, repentance for all known sin, activity in all good works, and what in modern phrase we term the "religion of common life." That writer cannot be called a formalist, who urges that the real question is "whether a month of daily attendance at church has made the life better;"² nor a mere clericalist, who

¹ Photius, Bibl. 174, and Dict. Chr. Biogr. I. 533. Among the Constantinopolitan homilies were those on the Acts, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, and Hebrews.

² In Act. Hom. 29. 3.

affirms that “every believing man is holy in that he is a believer, though he be stationed in secular life;”¹ nor a rigorist, who was afterwards charged with too great readiness to extend to penitents the assurance of Divine pardon.² It will not be supposed that he would neglect any means of impressing the mind or moving the will, who could condescend to draw illustrations³ from such homely things as the thanks given by beggars for alms, or the training required by dancers on the tight rope, not to say by athletes at Olympia. In this he did but imitate the Apostle whom he specially

¹ In Heb. Hom. 10. 4. So in Eph. Hom. 11. 5, he had said at Antioch, “We are not lords over your faith, nor do we give you these directions in a despotic tone. . . . We hold the place of advisers,” etc.

² Soc. vi. 21.

³ Photius describes his style as “clear, brilliant, flowing, exhibiting a rich variety of thoughts and an abundance of appropriate illustrations.” Bibl. 174. One of the most elaborate is the contrast between a legitimate monarch who can, and a usurper who cannot afford to lay aside for a time his royal purple,—adduced in the comment on Phil. ii. 6.

reverenced,¹—let us rather say Paul's Master and his own.

But what was Chrysostom like in the administration of his diocese? To begin with, his aversion for the luxury which often ministered to sin, and his distaste for the display which Nectarius had retained from secular antecedents, attracted a good deal of unfriendly criticism. Like Gregory Nazianzen, he could never have been at home in the high society of the capital. The stunted shrivelled figure, the bald head, the homely dress, would have been like a skeleton at the feast in those grand chambers where, in his absence, he would be the topic of the hour. "He has sold the furniture of the episcopal palace; he spends his official income on hospitals, and condescends to be maintained by Olympias."

¹ See his *Homilies De laudibus Pauli*, and *De Sacerd.* iv. 6-8.

—a pious widow of rank who became his devoted adherent;¹—“he entertains nobody, he will be nobody’s guest; he takes his hermit-like meals alone. So eccentric, so unsocial, so out of keeping with his position, so unlike the genial tone of our late bishop!” The fact was that Chrysostom’s health, probably damaged by early austerities, made the strictest abstemiousness simply necessary.² Others had reasons of a more personal kind for contrasting him with his easy-going predecessor. The tone of the clergy, as a body, had been lowered, and slackness, as usual, had in some cases become sin. Chrysostom

¹ See *Soz.* viii. 9. Olympias, a high-born lady, had been held in esteem by Nectarius, who made her a deaconess, and had shown munificent kindness to several bishops. She was about forty years old at Chrysostom’s accession. Beside suffering persecution for his cause, she had very bad health: Ep. 3. Part of Ep. 2 is a somewhat fulsome panegyric on her asceticism. In fact, Epp. 1-4 are rather tracts than letters.

² Palladius, p. 102; *Soz.* viii. 9. He had to be very careful about his food at Cucusus, in 405: Ep. 6.

deposed two deacons for grave offences, and rebuked other clerics for various faults—too severely, in the opinion of a not very favourable historian, who adds, however, that his object was moral reform.¹ But he showed some want of judgment when he gave his whole confidence to a hot-tempered archdeacon,² who bluntly advised him, in the presence of his clergy, to “drive them all with one stick.” Like other single-hearted reformers, he was disposed to make short work of abuses and scandals, to allow but little for old habits, to expect too much and too soon in the way of improvement, to be over-sharp in punishing the results of long-established laxity. The accounts of the Church “steward” and of the episcopal household were rigorously examined, and

¹ Socrates, vi. 4. Tillemont thinks him unfair to Chrysostom : xi. 422.

² An anonymous writer, whose account is added to Soc. vi. 23, gives a better account of Serapion.

expenditure which had been a matter of course under Nectarius was found to be out of the question under Chrysostom.¹ He could find fault, and not always gently:² if one of his "genuine" disciples seemed proud of some piece of self-denial, a significant rebuke in ironical form would describe him as a "drinker," or as "covetous."³ Fine ladies, three especially, "devout and honourable" in their own esteem, had to hear admonitions not wholly unlike those which Knox addressed to the attendants of Mary Stuart: the widows on the Church's "list" were reproved for self-indulgent living: monks were censured for breaking that rule of seclusion which, in his work on "the Priesthood,"⁴ Chrysostom had referred to as

¹ Palladius, p. 46.

² Sozomen says that he was "naturally disposed to rebuke," viii. 3.

³ Palladius, p. 186.

⁴ *De Sacerd.* vi. 7.

screening them from many temptations, and, so far, detracting from their credit for piety: great personages attached to the court were astonished by the brusque emphasis of the bishop's remarks on follies or vices: and it was natural for those whose plumes he had ruffled to relieve their feelings by calling him "choleric."¹ There was probably some foundation for the charge: perhaps he would have said, like Archbishop Laud, that "he could not undertake that he should not sometimes speak too hastily and sharply, and in a tone which might be liable to misinterpretation with them that were not acquainted with him." Such things were sure to tell; and while some persons owed him a grudge for wounds inflicted on their self-complacency, others deemed him "haughty" because, as his biographer admits, "he did not

¹ Soc. vi. 4: and see the charges at the Council of the Oak.

trouble himself to be agreeable to any chance person," or, as a shoemaker tersely phrased it, "when you met him anywhere outside the church, you could seldom get him to stop and have a word with you."¹ He would certainly have done better to remember that trivial courtesies do not always mean time wasted, and that the colloquial kindliness which shows something of a pastor's heart may speak through hearts to consciences and souls. But when the bishop met with a case of real distress, his sympathy started forth in practical form. He would interpose between a poor man and a powerful oppressor, or interest himself in the details of a lawsuit ; he might be seen ministering at sick beds, or penetrating into prisons, or providing foreigners with lodging, or bringing comfort to the widow and the fatherless. He made not a few converts from Paganism

¹ *Palladius*, p. 182.

and from heresy: he organised a mission to the Arian Goths: he procured an order for the destruction of idols in Southern Palestine; but, as we shall see, he knew better than to imagine that the arm of flesh could do the work of the Spirit among those who were still in “darkness and error.”

That Chrysostom made mistakes is evident: they were the mistakes of a highly sensitive nature, accustomed for years to oratorical self-expression, and apt, in the very consciousness of pure intentions, to look only at one aspect of a case, and to fail in that large considerateness which belongs to the wisdom of public men. If his eagerness, impulsiveness, and vivid emotional glow make him more humanly attractive than Athanasius, he lacks the equipoise of qualities, the serene, mature, comprehensive judgment, which mark out the “born king” among his brethren. One observes this defect

in his organisation of a Catholic procession to rival that of the Arians as they passed through the streets to their meeting-place outside the city, the result, of course, being a serious collision ; in the well-meant nomination of one of his own deacons for the great see of Ephesus, and of another Constantinopolitan cleric for the see of Nicomedia, from which, by a stretch of authority,¹ although with due synodical form, he had ejected a very unfit occupant ; and, if the received story is credible, in the hastiness with which, on the *ex parte* representation of his archdeacon, he took stringent measures

¹ His interference in the Church affairs of Asia was not warranted by any right then belonging to his see. But he had been invited to correct disorders in the Church of Ephesus ; and his predecessor had attempted, in vain, to eject this same Gerontius from Nicomedia : Soz. viii. 6. Undoubtedly Chrysostom's action contributed to that informal acquisition of patriarchal power in Asia which was formally secured to the see of Constantinople by the Council of Chalcedon, when, as Neale expresses it, “custom was made law :” Introd. to Hist. of East. Ch. i. 28.

against a bishop who had represented him in his absence, and would not pardon him until the Empress had humbled herself to ask it as a favour. But, although the reconciliation was publicly effected, Severian did not forget. Two other prelates shared his dislike for Chrysostom; one of them, named Acacius, had been disgusted, when he visited the capital, by what he deemed the poorness of the accommodation provided for him, and said in the hearing of some of the clergy, that "*he* would season a dish for their bishop." Others, lay and clerical, had been nursing their wrath and were biding their time: the Empress Eudoxia herself had become ill-affected to a pastor so loftily uncompromising: and thus the clouds gathered which ere long burst into a storm. Whatever might have been his errors of judgment, and failures in regard to tact or manner, one must needs recognise the truth of Milner's caustic

comment, that if he would have been content to go on in the path followed by several bishops, "he would have given no offence, and done no good."

The malcontents applied to a powerful helper. Theophilus of Alexandria had never forgiven Chrysostom for having been the cause of his mortification and disappointment. He himself had now taken a strong part against some of the monks of Egypt, who were charged with entertaining unsound views, derived from the speculations of Origen.¹ The charge was concocted by illiterate and bigoted monks, whose dogged literalism in regard to the anthropomorphic language of the Old Testament² was really offensive to Theophilus himself, as inconsistent with a

¹ See Appendix IX.

² For Chrysostom's teaching on these "accommodations," see *In Daniel*. c. 7, and his last work, *Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt*, c. 3; see also *Augustine*, c. *Ep. Manich.* 25, "carnales et parvulos nostros," etc. The Syrian sect of *Audians* fell into this error; *Theodoret H. E.* iv. 10.

belief in the Divine spirituality. But, for policy's sake, he pretended to agree with them ; and the minority, branded with the reproach of "Origenism," were hunted out of their monastic homes, and compelled to seek refuge first at Palestine, then at Constantinople. So it was that, towards the end of 401, fifty exiles, the chief of whom were called the Tall Brothers, asked admission to Chrysostom's presence, and threw themselves as petitioners at his feet, begging him to intercede for them with Theophilus, but intimating that if he would not, they would be obliged to apply to the Emperor. Chrysostom treated the case with cautious moderation,¹ and thereby offended both parties. Theophilus, like one eager to pick a quarrel,

¹ For one thing, he allowed the strangers to attend the Eucharistic celebration, but not to communicate while they were under the ban of their own patriarch ; he advised them not to complain of Theophilus to the Emperor, and he wrote to Theophilus, requesting him to be reconciled to them.

replied angrily to Chrysostom's gentle letter, and stirred up Epiphanius, the aged, learned, and rigidly orthodox metropolitan of Cyprus, to take steps against "Origenism," as a heresy which was being patronised at Constantinople. Epiphanius thereupon came to Constantinople, and invaded Chrysostom's jurisdiction by performing an episcopal act without his leave.¹ He was, however, brought to see the questionable position in which he had placed himself, and somewhat hastily returned home. Then Theophilus, summoned by the Emperor to meet charges laid against him by the exiles, arrived at Constantinople in the character of accuser, and even of judge, rather than as a party accused,² made himself the centre of all the malcontents, and with

¹ See Socrates, vi. 12; Sozomen, viii. 14.

² Chrysostom vainly invited Theophilus to a personal conference, and declined Arcadius' order to go and hear the complaints which had been lodged against him: Ep. 1. to Innocent.

them held a synod at a place near Chalcedon, called the Oak.

Two lists of charges against Chrysostom were handed in.¹ The first contained imputations on his official and personal conduct; the Origenistic question appeared only in the second. It seems clear that the majority of the clergy, but not of the laity, had been "perverted," as Chrysostom's friend and biographer tells us, by his enemies. Chrysostom, however, was surrounded by forty bishops, whom he endeavoured to cheer by repeating such texts as "To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain."² One sees the whole man in the question, "Are we better

¹ Photius, Bibl. 59. The chief accusers were a bishop named Isaac, and John, one of the deacons, whom he had deposed. Stephens calls the charges "monstrous and incredible :" Life of Chrys. p. 314. Words of Chrysostom's, apparently, were torn from their context, and indignant expressions which he had used were transformed into violent acts. It is impossible to rely on such plainly concocted evidence. See Appendix X.

² Palladius, p. 68.

than patriarchs, prophets, and apostles?"—in the remark, "Preaching did not begin with me, and will not end with me;"—in the exhortation, "If they force you to communicate with them, do so, in order to avoid a schism,—but do not subscribe the decree which they may pass against me."

That decree was a foregone conclusion for a tribunal so disgracefully tainted by animosities; but when it was made known at Constantinople, the people set themselves to defend their bishop by guarding the cathedral for two full days. On the second day, he preached to them, beginning, "Many are the billows; but we stand on the rock!"^v Anticipating a forcible severance, he reminded his flock that he and they were united by an affection which no power could break, and that the trouble had arisen out of his desire for their well-being; and protested that he submitted himself absolutely to the will of

God, whether it were for his expulsion or for his stay. “Wherever *He* wills me to be, I give Him thanks!”¹

At last, the feeble resistance which the Emperor had opposed to the faction of Theophilus was overborne; orders were given that Chrysostom should be expelled and banished; and on the third day he was, as he himself says,² conducted through the city by a government official, and transported into Bithynia. But on the next day, the appearance of Theophilus in the cathedral, and the delivery of a sermon which denounced Chrysostom on the score of pride, provoked an outbreak of popular wrath; measures taken to suppress it increased the agitation, and crowds thundered at the gate

¹ Serm. antequam iret in exsilio, 2.

² Ep. 1 to Innocent, 2. Evidently Socrates (vi. 15) has transferred to this occasion the account of the private departure and self-surrender, which belongs to the final expulsion in 404. See Palladius, p. 90.

of the palace, “Give us back our bishop!”¹ In the evening a shock of earthquake struck terror into the heart of Eudoxia; she easily persuaded her husband to recall Chrysostom, who was escorted home by a joyous multitude,—even mothers with their babes rushing into the water to meet his vessel. In spite of his own remonstrances, he was practically constrained to resume his seat in the church “of the Apostles,” and to give a short address, beginning, “What shall I say? Blessed be God! This I said when I went away, and this I reiterate now.”²

There was, for the present, a breathing time. But Chrysostom’s demand for a new

¹ Soz. viii. 18.

² Serm. 1 post redditum. A second sermon in strange taste represents Theophilus as a Pharaoh, who had taken away his Sarah (*i.e.* the church to which he was espoused); and proceeds to eulogise Eudoxia for having professed in a letter that she was guiltless of the wrong done to him. It is possible that, in the gladness of the moment, his warm heart may have believed her.

synod¹ was received with coldness; and the Empress was again alienated by his vehement indignation at certain unseemly exhibitions which greeted the inauguration of a silver statue representing her in imperial array, erected on a porphyry column within a short distance of St. Sophia. He was said to refer, in a sermon, to Herodias and to the “demand for the head of John.”² Eudoxia was now ready to assist in any new designs against Chrysostom: a technical ground was taken,—“He was deposed by a synod, and ought not to have resumed his see without at least an equivalent authority.”³ A Council met at Constantinople, and con-

¹ He afterwards tells Innocent that he is quite ready to defend himself before an “uncorrupt tribunal.”

² Soc. vi. 18. “It is true,” says Tillemont significantly, as if thinking of some French court-clergy, “that he knew nothing of that ‘prudence’ and ‘discretion’ which belong to people who make an idol, not of their princes, but of the gain they expect from them:” xi. 216.

³ They relied upon a canon of the Council of Antioch of 341, which had been framed against Athanasius.

strained Arcadius to order Chrysostom to depart. The bishop declined the responsibility of doing so, and was then removed from the cathedral to his own home. On the Easter-eve of 404, a sacrilegious attack was made by a body of soldiers on a congregation of his adherents: blows were struck at defenceless persons: blood was shed in the baptistery, the soldiers penetrated into the sanctuary, and the Eucharistic chalice itself was profaned.¹ This scene was followed up by a series of tyrannous measures against those who now began to be called "Johnians;" and, at the end of the Easter season, Arcadius, under dictation from the hostile bishops, sent a message ordering Chrysostom to depart. This time he thought it best to obey: in the baptistery of the cathedral he took leave of Olympias and three other faithful women,

¹ Chrys. Ep. 1. to Innocent, 3. Cp. Palladius, p. 85.

begging them, as his one last request, to keep up their loyal interest in the Church, to submit to any new bishop who had *unwillingly* accepted the appointment, and who had the assent of all,—“for the Church cannot go on without a bishop,”—and to remember him in their prayers.¹ Few speeches of farewell from a pastor, since that day of sad parting on the shore of Miletus, can have touched hearts so deeply as these simple words from the “mouth of gold.” The poor ladies fell weeping at his feet; he bade a priest lead them away, lest they should excite the people, and then, with a few words of natural resentment at the unrighteous treatment which he had received,² he went out by a door opposite to the great gate at which the people were waiting for him, surrendered himself to one

¹ Palladius, p. 90.

² Soz. viii. 22 makes him say that he had been denied that fair hearing which was granted by law to criminals.

of the imperial officers, was placed in a boat, and landed, as before, on the coast of Bithynia. It was Monday, June 20, 404.

The remainder, and, as Gibbon calls it, the “most glorious” part of his life¹—three years and nearly three months—was passed in exile. We can trace him as he travels eastwards to a little town called Cucusus, at the extremity of Lesser Armenia, where one of his predecessors, repeatedly persecuted by Arians, had died a tragical death.² After

¹ See Gibbon, iv. 156. He was detained till July 4 at Nicæa, where he enjoyed the good air of the place, and his guards showed their respect and affection by doing all and more than all that he wanted : Ep. 10. In another letter he says that they did not let him feel the want of servants : Ep. 11. Just before proceeding on his journey he wrote to a priest, urging him to provide for the interests of the churches in Phœnicia, Arabia, and Syria, and to keep him regularly informed as to the mission to the Pagans in Phœnicia : Ep. 221. He wrote also to bishops and clerics imprisoned as “Johnians,” and called their chains a “crown,” Ep. 118, 3; cp. Ep. 174, beginning, “Blessed are ye for your imprisonment.” Writing to Olympias, he reminds her of what he had often said—that the narrow way and the broad way are alike *ways*, that respectively have an end : Ep. 8.

² Paul, four times expelled from his see, died at Cucusus,

an exhausting journey from Nicæa¹ he reaches the great city of Cæsarea in Cappadocia; and there he exhibits that “elasticity and sunniness of mind” which Cardinal Newman marks as one of his most attractive characteristics, likening him to “a day in spring-time, bright and rainy, and glittering through its rain.”² He makes the most of the simple solaces which the Cappadocian capital can offer; it brings us, somehow, nearer to the saint to find him complacently dwelling, in his letters,—most charmingly human and vivid letters,—on the comfort of having pure water to drink, bread to eat that was not mouldy, “a bath of some kind, instead of broken jars,” a real bed on which to lie down,³ and the attention of excellent

—it was said, by strangulation,—in 350-1; see Athan. Hist. Ari. 7.

¹ Ep. 120. He begins, “I am spent, I am used up:” he was fever-stricken. The populations had testified their sympathy as he passed: Ep. 8, 9.

² Historical Sketches, iii. 237.

³ Ep. 120.

physicians, whose kindness did him as much good as their professional skill,¹ together with the practical sympathy of a crowd of reverential visitors,² including men of high civil rank, but *not* including Pharetrius the bishop, a very unworthy successor of St. Basil, whose jealous unfriendliness was evidently the cause of the malignant hostility shown to Chrysostom by a number of ignorant fanatical monks. They plotted to get rid of the visitor who, although under the ban of power, was “stealing away hearts;” and so we find him³ compelled by false alarms, first to leave the city amid the loudly expressed indignation of many sympathisers,⁴ and then to lose the shelter of a country house five miles off, because its mistress, at heart his well-wisher, could not

¹ Ep. 12.

² Ep. 125.

³ He tells the story to Olympias in Ep. 14, which Montfaucon justly calls “*egregia*.”

⁴ They “uttered imprecations” against Pharetrius.

venture to defy the angry menaces of her own bishop. Accordingly, Evethius, a priest sent by Pharetrius, rouses the exile at dead of night: “The barbarians are upon us!” There is no help for it, Chrysostom must rise at once and depart; lights are not permitted,—“for they would attract the notice of the Isaurians.” In the moonless darkness, the mule which draws the bishop’s litter stumbles on the steep rocky pathway, and brings him to the ground; Evethius dismounts, helps him to walk, or rather pulls him along, still enfeebled by illness, and expecting every moment an onset of Isaurians, who in fact were far enough off. At last, in the end of August, he arrived at Cucusus, a bleak “lost corner” of the world, without a market,¹ but full of warmhearted souls, from the bishop downwards, who would even have resigned the see in his

¹ Ep. 14.

favour, had not Chrysostom declined, alleging a Church "rule."¹ We hear of one layman of rank who gave up his own house for Chrysostom's temporary lodging, set about preparing him a permanent abode, and was so assiduous as to make our saint uneasy about causing such trouble.² Others showed a similarly generous spirit. His letters written at this time are pictures of his situation and of his feelings. The place, to be sure, is very lonesome, but then its extreme quietness is a "delight;"³ there is no one there to "molest or harry him;" "his health is somewhat restored;" he has more contributions for his own wants than he knows what to do with;⁴ he can engage in correspondence

¹ Ep. 125.

² Ep. 13.

³ Cp. Epp. 14, 80, 84, 111, 114, 173, 236, etc. An aged deaconess met him on his arrival, and said she was ready to go with him if he were sent into Scythia: Ep. 13.

⁴ Ep. 50, to Diogenes. He sends back some presents, adding, in the true spirit of a gentleman, "If I should be in want, I will ask for them again with the utmost confidence, as if they belonged to me."

with Olympias and many other friends ; and his letters admit us into his heart. He does not mind saying that it is a pain to him not to hear from those whom he loves. He entreats them to relieve his anxiety about their health ; he asks one friend to send him “showers of letters ;” he complains that he has written twice to another, and got no reply ;¹ he reminds Olympias that “offences” and trials of faith are conditions of Church life ;² he thanks a lady, herself an invalid, but a constant correspondent, for sending him ointments and a plaster ;³ he writes to another, “If you bear present troubles thankfully and bravely, the richer will be your reward from our gracious God ;”⁴

¹ Ep. 41, to Valentinus, whom (in Ep. 217) he urges to provide for the famishing widows and virgins at home : on the pain of parting from friends, see Ep. 2. 12.

² Ep. 1. He bids her call “ceaselessly on Jesus.”

³ Ep. 34, to Carteria. He adds, “You will greatly oblige me if you can tell me soon that you are well again.” Cp. Ep. 18, “It pains me to hear of your being ill.”

⁴ Ep. 76, to Chalcidia. In a later letter to her he speaks

he tells another that Christians must not be less bold than merchants or traders;¹ he reminds a deaconess that “pains pass away with life, but the prizes won by endurance are imperishable;”² he refers some Gothic monks to St. Paul’s “reckoning” as to “sufferings” and “glory;”³ he advises an exiled bishop to persevere in prayer although relief might be delayed, and to think of the calumnies and outrages endured by the Saviour;⁴ he has sympathy also for purely domestic afflictions, and consoles a prefect whose brother has lately died.⁵ He as Augustine might have spoken about life, as a “journey” to the “Country;”—“travellers speeding homewards care neither for meadows nor for ravines:” Ep. 105.

¹ Ep. 106, to Asyneritia and her companions.

² Ep. 96. He also quotes 1 Cor. ii. 9.

³ Ep. 207.

⁴ Ep. 125, to Cyriacus. He dwells on the flight into Egypt, on the epithets of “demoniac, winebibber,” etc., and on the details of the Passion. Cyriacus, persecuted in the East, came to Rome early in 405, and afterwards, falling into the hands of the adverse party, endured much cruel treatment. Palladius, p. 198.

⁵ Ep. 197, to Studius.

does not forget that he is still by right a chief pastor; he takes thought for the spiritual needs of his bereaved flock, commends two of its priests who have lost school-teacherships through their fidelity,¹ and rebukes two others who have neglected their duty of preaching.² A priest has converted the Pagans of a neighbouring mountain district; Chrysostom gives him an introduction to a friendly layman at Constantinople.³ Olympias is not to vex herself because the place of his exile is not changed; he would rather be nearer home, yet on the whole he might be worse off.⁴ But the winter, which, even for that harsh climate, was severe, brought back his old ailments of head-

¹ Epp. 213, 218.

² One had preached only five times up to October, the other not once; they had avoided church services: this pains him more than “the solitude here.” Epp. 203, 210, 212. He says to one of them, “You know what became of him who buried his one talent!”

³ Ep. 175.

⁴ Ep. 13.

ache, sickness, and sleeplessness; for two months he never ventured out of his room, kept up fires, endured smoke, and spent days in bed, pierced with cold under a heap of bedclothes;¹ it was like "one long night" to him; and the dreariness was increased by "the fear of freebooters," which "kept the town in a state of siege, while the roads were blocked up by the winter."² Few visitors interrupted the solitude, and of those few not all seemed to him quite friendly. As the spring advances, he recovers somewhat; he welcomes the arrival of friends—among them a bishop, who, on leaving him, is recommended to a skilful physician at Cæsarea for the cure of a bad cough,³—and

¹ Ep. 6, to Olympias.

² Ep. 216, to Musonius. In Ep. 104, he says, "As we hear, Isauria is *up!*!" The freebooters made actual raids at the end of the winter, captured some ladies, and slew some men: Ep. 140. A present for Chrysostom miscarried, the bearer having turned back in fear of the banditti.

³ Ep. 38, to Hymnetius. "Since you understand the

a priest from Antioch, who writes that he felt like another man after conversing with him.¹ He spends money sent by Olympias in ransoming some captives from the Isaurians ; and while, as Newman expresses it, he “colours everything with his own sweet, cheerful, thankful temper,” his kind words draw out love from many who have no need of pecuniary help.² He interests himself in a mission to the Pagans of Phœnicia ; exhorts the monks and priests employed there to persevere in their holy enterprise ; and provides them with clothes and shoes out of funds placed at his disposal.³

nature of the complaint, pray endeavour to deliver him from its attack.” Hymnetius had attended Chrysostom : Ep. 81.

¹ Ep. 237, a letter from Constantius to his mother. He says that he feels spiritually enriched after being with “the holy bishop.” He had learned one of Chrysostom’s sayings, “There is no real calamity but sin.” Cp. Ep. 102.

² Soz. viii. 27.

³ Epp. 53, 123. In Ep. 21, he thanks Alphius for sending a priest into Phœnicia. “I knew you supplied him with money, though you did not tell me *that*! . . . You are rich with the riches which one *ought* to possess.”

So passed the year 405; in the winter, it appears, fresh descents of the Isaurians made it prudent for him to change his abode. He seems actually to have taken shelter in glens and woods, until he found quarters in a fortress which dominated the town of Arabisus,¹ sixty miles from Cucusus. There he had to look forth on ruined homes, and snowdrifts ominously checked with red, and to hear of fugitives, including boys, who fled in terror from their homes to die of cold in the open country.² "We sit here," he writes, "like creatures caught in a snare. One night, all of a sudden, a band of three hundred Isaurians fell upon the town, and all but got hold of us." He was fortunately asleep, and knew nothing of the peril till next day.³ After this he could not feel safe,

¹ Ep. 69. He alludes to these removals in Ep. 127: "We lead the life of 'Hainaxobii' and 'Nomads.'"

² Ep. 127, cp. Ep. 68.

³ Ep. 135. See Ep. 15: "Andronicus tells me he fell

even within the prison-like castle;¹ there were also serious apprehensions of a scarcity. No wonder that his old complaints returned; and although good physicians were accessible, they had but few medical appliances.² Yet he found work to do among poor people in the uplands, who were “pagans” in both senses of the word;³ and the bishop, whom he mentions as friendly,⁴ must have rejoiced to secure for them the opportunity for hearing about Christ from one who was not only the great Christian preacher of his time, but a pre-eminent exemplar of Christian patience and sanctity. He was able to return to Cucusus in the summer,⁵ a season “delight-

into the hands of the robbers, and only escaped with the loss of everything. Do not send any one hither.”

¹ Epp. 70, 131: “For the Isaurians make attempts even on such strongholds.”

² Ep. 15.

³ Palladius, p. 97.

⁴ Ep. 126. His name was Otreius.

⁵ To this year is referred a letter to Theodotus, a Reader, who had left him after a short visit. He would gladly

ful to him" in those highlands; and in a letter written soon afterwards he returns to the subject of the Phœnician mission, which has been endangered by a Pagan outbreak, and urges a priest, remarkable for courage and gentleness, to lose no time in going to the rescue. "If I can but hear that you have actually crossed the borders of Phœnicia, then I shall be at ease, I shall feel refreshed. . . . I would send a thousand times to Constantinople if so I could facilitate your labours."¹ Could any utterance be more characteristic? He had built much on the expected intervention of Western prelates, which was warmly promoted by his staunch friend, the Roman bishop Innocent;² see him again, but is afraid that a journey in the hot weather would be bad for his weak eyes. "I do beg you to be very careful about your eyes, to consult physicians," etc.: Ep. 102. Another Theodotus, a deacon, who visited him in the winter, is warmly praised in Ep. 135.

¹ Ep. 126.

² Pope Innocent acted nobly in the whole affair of Chrysostom's persecution. He wrote to the faithful clergy of

but the delegates sent to the East were contumeliously repulsed, and the persecution of “Johnian” bishops went on unchecked, and involved his friends in various forms of cruel suffering. Innocent could but wait for a better opportunity ; and Chrysostom writes to him, “I expect that there *will* be something like a setting right of this wrong ; but if not, still *you* have the reward awaiting you at the hand of your gracious God ; and I, now in the third year of my exile, amid famine and pestilence, and wars and besiegings, and indescribable loneliness, and ‘daily dying,’ and Isaurian swords, derive no

Constantinople, “Christ’s servants can console each other by remembering what the saints have suffered before now. If we are but steadfast in faith, there is nothing that we ought to despair of obtaining from the Lord.” He wrote to Chrysostom : “ *You* do not need to be reminded that the best men are often being tested by affliction. A good man can be trained in patience, but cannot be overcome ; for the Scriptures which we read to the people keep guard over his mind. Let your conscience console you, dearest brother,” etc., *Soz.* viii. 26.

small comfort from your boldness, your good-will, your endearing and genuine love.”¹

Once more the winter came on, but he had learned how to protect himself against its rigour:² by keeping up good fires, and staying indoors well wrapt up, he managed to take no harm; and a medicine which a lady had sent him proved efficacious,³ so that when he came abroad, the natives were surprised to see him looking so well. He set to work on two religious treatises,⁴ in the latter of which he observed that “the Church did not teach so persuasively when she was not harassed, as now she teaches the

¹ Ep. 2, to Innocent.

² Ep. 4.

³ He says that within a few days it allayed inflammation, acted as a tonic, and gave a good appetite; he desires to obtain a fresh supply.

⁴ “That no one can harm him who does not injure himself,” and “To those who have been scandalised on account of adversities, and also on the incomprehensibleness of God,” his old theme, in treating of which he quotes Rom. ix. 20 as indicating—“not the absence of free will, far from it! but the spirit of submissiveness which should check presumptuous speculation.”

world to endure suffering," and that while the sufferers—his own adherents—"could look any one freely and cheerfully in the face, the oppressors go about shame-stricken and fearful, carrying an evil conscience within them."¹ His sanguine spirit began to hope that he might even yet be restored to Constantinople. But this was not to be; the interest taken in his cause, the pilgrimages, so to speak, made to Cucucus from Antioch, were like "lashes," says Palladius, to the hostile bishops of Syria;² they obtained an order for his removal to Pityus, a desolate place on the eastern shore of the Euxine. The sentence was carried out in the summer of 407. The guards who took him in charge were evidently instructed

¹ "Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt," 23, 24.

² Pallad. p. 97. Tillemont renders this, "autant de coups de poignard," xii. 344. Chrysostom had naturally many friends at Antioch. He wrote to four priests there in 405, "It was your affection that found my long letter short :" Ep. 22.

to hurry him on without forbearance, amid scorching heat and drenching rain, as if the object was to kill him by exhaustion. At last, after a terrible time, they reached Comana, in Pontus, passed by it, and halted for the night at a wayside chapel.¹ Next morning, feeling very ill, he begged to stay where he was “until the fifth hour;” his conductors would not hear of it, and hurried him off, still fasting. After going rather more than three miles, he was evidently unable to walk further. They returned to the little church; he put on clean white garments, made his last Communion, offered a final prayer, concluding with his habitual doxology,² “Glory to God for all things,

¹ One of the guards showed him some humanity when not observed by the other. His baldness made the heat more painful. Pallad. p. 99.

² In a letter of 404 he declares that this is what he will never cease to say, whatever befalls him: Ep. 12. Cp. Ep. 193: “As soon as one utters it, the cloud of despondency disperses.” Cp. in Col. Hom. 8. 5: “To give thanks in

Amen," and then stretched out his feet, and tranquilly expired. It was Saturday, the 14th of September, the day of the martyrdom of St. Cyprian, the day now called after the Holy Cross, in the year 407.

"I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity, and therefore I die in exile," the well-known last words of Gregory VII., would have been most appropriate in Chrysostom's case, although he himself would scarcely have so used them. The special impressiveness of the contest in which he became involved, and which actually brought him to his death, is of a kind to be appreciated by those who profess to feel but little interest in dogmatic controversies, to care only for struggles involving an ethical principle. It was not for his orthodoxy, but it was for his

prosperity is no great matter; but when we do so in extremity of distress, *that* is wonderful. . . . There is nothing holier than the tongue which gives thanks to God amid afflictions." See in Eph. Hom. 19. 2.

intense devotion to high Christian morality,¹ for his resolute hostility to laxities, abuses, and corruptions, his determination to make the kingdom of Christ a felt power in the face of the world, that “the glorious preacher with soul of zeal and lips of flame”² was relentlessly hunted down by a persecution which signally illustrates the eighth Beatitude. And the story of his episcopate, while it exhibits with unique and terrible clearness the force which can be used in an unjust cause by worldly ecclesiastics, against a spiritual loftiness which has crossed their path, rebuked their unfaithfulness, or galled their pride, is also one of the most inspiriting testimonies to the moral power of a purely unworldly life, and the im-

¹ “Unquestionable as the intellectual genius of Chrysostom was, yet it is rather in the purity of his moral character, his single-minded boldness of purpose, and the glowing piety which burns through all his writings, that we find the secret of his influence.” Stephens, *Life of Chrysostom*, p. 430.

² See *Lyra Apostolica*, p. 118.

perishable fruitfulness of a really saintly example. “St. John Chrysostom,” says Cardinal Newman, in the exquisite sketch of his confessorship which has been already more than once quoted, “was one of that select company whom men begin to understand and honour when they are removed from them;”¹ but few indeed among the crowds which attended his funeral, or which went forth to meet his remains when brought back, thirty years later, to Constantinople,² could have anticipated that a name which had been so determinedly cast out as evil would so indefeasibly inherit the earth.

The Parisian Breviary contains an appropriate petition, asking on behalf of Christ’s ministers “the spirit of wisdom and fortitude whereby the blessed John Chrysostom did not cease to rebuke sinners, and endured manifold afflictions for the love of the Lord’s Name.”

¹ Hist. Sketches, iii. 302.

² Soc. vii. 45.

ST. AUGUSTINE.

NO Christian teacher since the days of the Apostles has influenced Christian thought so powerfully as St. Augustine. This influence has sometimes been, so to speak, imperial: the “Doctor of Grace” has reigned in the schools of theology; his Benedictine editors in the seventeenth century described him as “the oracle of the Church;”¹ and, as Archbishop Trench has told us, a Spanish sermon was proverbially said to lack its best ingredient if it contained nothing out of Augustine.² The most systematic mind among the Reformers adopted certain parts of his theology as the basis for a structure

¹ See the first words of their dedication to Louis XIV.

² See Trench on Proverbs, p. 58.

which has now become a rock of offence; and our own Anglican formularies bear the impress of his teaching on the relations of the soul to sin and to grace, and, though in a modified form, on predestination. At present, indeed, there is a fashion of “anti-Augustinianism:” “a tendency,” as it has been said, “to put down to Augustine all that the present age likes least in Christianity, and to jump to the conclusion that what is vaguely called Alexandrianism is the natural antidote to Latin theology.” No doubt, as Dr. Newman said half a century ago, “Augustine’s teaching” has a character of its own, and “is, in a certain sense, a second edition of the Catholic traditions, the transmission of the primitive stream through one acute, rich, and original mind.”¹ He did accentuate some principles in Christian anthropology, on which earlier Fathers

¹ *British Critic*, xxv. 412.

had not laid such stress, and he did, to some extent, exaggerate those principles ; but in themselves, they inhered in the original Christianity as taught continuously by the Catholic Church. This cannot be said of his predestinarianism ; but the aversion to Augustinian conceptions of which we now hear so much is probably determined less by a disapproval of what we now call Calvinism, than by a dislike for the sacramental and ecclesiastical ideas to which Augustine gave a specially definite expression, but which are really found in Tertullian, Irenæus, and Ignatius, not to say Cyprian, and cannot be set aside without a rejection of some leading features of that religion which has ever been embodied in ordinances and in a Church.¹

¹ See Gore on the Ministry, pp. 13, 59. Undoubtedly Augustine was not an “individualist” in the sense of supposing the visible Church to be an association formed by “the natural attraction of sympathies and aims” between persons who had otherwise been brought into fellowship with Christ. To him, the historical organised Church was

This may be said at the outset, by way of meeting a prejudice, connected with views of Christianity which would make it fluid rather than solid.

Let us turn to one aspect of Augustine's life and character, which must never be forgotten in any attempt to estimate his influence. Perhaps one might express this best by saying that the "Confessions" are at the root of the matter. That marvellous book,

a Divinely formed body corporate, in and through which, by Christ's sacramental operation, such fellowship was initiated and maintained. But, if he was thus what some would call an "ecclesiasticist," he was at any rate persuaded that a good "paterfamilias" could, in his own sphere, "fulfil an ecclesiastical and, as it were, episcopal function, and minister to Christ" by making his household truly Christian: In *Joan. Ev. Tr.* 51. 13. He plainly recognises the "royal priesthood" of the baptised, while he would have absolutely repudiated the notion that it either excluded, or was excluded by, a ministerial priesthood, *de Civ. Dei*, xx. 10. Moreover, no Christian writer has ever been more thoroughly penetrated and possessed by a sense of what is involved in the words, "My God." It is quite easy to disparage his Churchmanship and his sacramentalism by such terms as "external" or "mechanical;" but these are "question-begging" terms.

“ The tenderest scroll
That love and recollection ever wrote,”

which has been translated again and again into almost every European language, “ and in all loved,”² which “ has been a precious possession to thousands of seekers after God,”³ and “ will be a classical work in the Church of Christ to the end of time,”⁴ has done more to make people understand and love Augustine than all his elaborate theological works. If the latter part of it bears traces of a somewhat morbid and over-scrupulous self-introspection, allowance may well be made for the unparalleled experience which had helped him to assimilate the great thought, “ God and I,”—the solitary position of the soul in the presence of its Maker and

¹ Bishop Alexander, St. Augustine’s Holiday, p. 6.

² Pusey, Pref. to Confessions of St. Augustine, in Library of the Fathers, p. xxii.

³ Cunningham, S. Austin and his Place in the History of Christian Thought, p. 80.

⁴ Liddon, Advent Sermons, ii. 63.

Master. Many who know of no other sentence in his writings are familiar with the saying which condenses his philosophy of life, "Thou, Lord, hast made us for Thyself, and therefore our hearts are restless until they rest in Thee."¹ Some may also have heard the sweet sad cadence of that "confession" in which the fervour of loving worship is blended with regret for mis-spent years; "Too late have I loved Thee, Thou Beauty so ancient and so new,—*sero te amavi*;" yet not really too late, for, as he adds, it had "beamed forth and driven away his blindness, had touched him and set his soul on fire."²

We can but briefly survey the process which terminated in 386 with his "conversion" to the service of our Lord. One sees the little boy,³ with his childish troubles and

¹ Confess. i. 1.

² Ib. x. 38.

³ He was born at Thagaste on Nov. 13 (de Beata Vita, 6) in 354, the year before that Council of Milan which

childish naughtinesses, preferring a game at ball to "reading, writing, and arithmetic;"¹ beaten at his day-school for shirking his lessons; telling petty falsehoods to the servant in charge of him, to his masters, and to his parents; pilfering sweet things from the home table to give to his schoolfellows, but quarrelling with them if caught playing unfairly: then the lively growing lad, sent from his own town to a grammar school elsewhere; liking his Virgil, but disliking his Homer; returning home at fifteen because his father can no longer pay for his schooling; idling about at nights with reckless youths, whose talk he imitates in order to seem manly; joining them, from sheer lawlessness, in the robbery of a neighbour's pear-tree;² drifting

was so unfortunate for the Catholics of the West. Unlike Chrysostom, he was the son of comparatively poor parents.

¹ *Confess.* i. 20.

² As he says, the pears themselves did not tempt him, he could get better at home; he flung them away when

into wild and evil courses ; “wandering,” as he expresses it, “far from his God, and becoming to himself a poverty-stricken land ;”¹ going up, as we should say, to the University of Carthage as a “poor youth” of seventeen, through the bounty of a well-to-do friend of his family ;² rising high in the Rhetoric class, with a view to the African bar, but at the same time carried away by theatrical excitement, and sinking fast into moral debasement,³ when a book

gathered. The zest of the adventure lay in its being wrong : Conf. ii. 9. He responded when his comrades said, “Let’s go, let’s do it.” He could not bear to be behindhand in audacity : ii. 17.

¹ Confess. ii. 18. Of course he is referring to “the prodigal :” so in iii. 11. In after-life he could not refrain from tears when that parable was read in church : viii. 6.

² Romanianus : c. Academ. ii. 3, on his constant kindness, and ib. i. 2, 3, on his virtues, which had been exercised by a reverse of fortune : cp. Conf. vi. 24.

³ His son Adeodatus was born when he was eighteen, in 372. He was a very promising boy, who died early : Conf. ix. 14. In a debate on the question, “What sort of man has God’s presence with him ?” Adeodatus answered, “He who has *not* an impure spirit.” “And who is *that*?” “He who lives chastely.” “And who is *that*?” He who looks

arrests him, fills his mind with better thoughts, and forms a landmark in his career. It is not a religious book at all ; it is the "Hortensius" of Cicero. The teaching of his pious mother Monica¹ has impressed him with reverence for the name of Christ ; he takes to reading Scripture, but its style is too homely for his academic fastidiousness ;² in his nineteenth year, as he himself reckons, we find him seeking for "truth" in that strange Manichean superstition which was

to God, and keeps himself for Him alone :" De Beata Vita, 12, 18. In Augustine's treatise, "On the Master," Adeodatus' thoughts are given in the form of a conversation with his father ; and he refers to the awful lines of Persius, Sat. iii. 35-38, "Magne pater divum," etc.

¹ He mentions her domestic virtues, her success as a peacemaker, her influence in the conversion of her husband, Conf. ix. 19-21 ; her fearlessness in regard to misfortune or even death, De Ordine, i. 32 ; her intellectual ability, De Ordine, ii. 1. He also gives a saying of hers, "He who wishes for evil things is wretched even if he has them," De Beata Vita, 10. The Roman Church commemorates St. Monica on May 4th.

² For his later view as to the "modus dicendi" of Scripture, see Epist. 137. 18.

not so much a form of Christianity perverted, as an elaborate fabric of heathenish thought, artistically, though superficially, Christianised, in which sacred terms “were emptied of all their ethical worth, and then used as a gorgeous symbolic garb for clothing a system different to its very core.”¹ Caught by the promise of a solution of such problems as the origin of evil,² and boyishly proud of having found his own way to a “rational” religion, he takes a mischievous pleasure in puzzling simple Church folk with Manichean objections, and perverts three of his friends to the same misbelief.³ In 375,

¹ Trench, *Huls. Lect.* p. 25. So Pusey in *Aug. Confess. Lib. Fath.* p. 344: “Manicheism assumed that it was that Christianity of which it had borrowed phrases.” There can be no doubt that Mani transmuted, so to speak, the Christian elements which he combined with “Zoroastrism” (compare the so-called Paterines and the Albigensians. “In the twelfth century,” says Milman, “Manicheism is rampant:” *Latin Christ.* v. 402.

² *Conf.* iii. 12; *De Lib. Arbitr.* i. 4; *De Mor. Manich.* 2.

³ Alypius, *Conf.* vi. 12; Romanianus, *c. Acad.* i. 3;

he returns to his native town, and gives instruction in grammar.¹ His mother, horror-stricken on discovering the state of his mind, consults a learned bishop; will he not take her son in hand, and convince him of his error? No, the bishop knows better than to force argument on him prematurely; it would but harden him in the pride of his supposed discovery; "let him alone awhile, and pray for him; his mind will probably work itself right." Mother-like, Monica still persists, and tearfully begs him to have a talk with Augustine; he answers, "Leave me, and God speed you; the son of those tears can never be lost!"² With this, perforce, she has to content herself; she sets herself to pray for his conversion, and does not "faint" because she seems to get no answer. Augustine loses a dear friend by

Honoratus, *de Util. Cred.* 3. On Alypius, see especially *Conf. vi. 11 ff.* He became bishop of Thagaste.

¹ *Conf. iv. 7.*

² *Ib. iii. 21.*

death ; but the blow does not (as perhaps his mother hoped) send him back to Christianity, though his theories reveal no supporting God, but leave him to blank despair.¹ Thagaste becomes hateful ; he seizes an opportunity of returning to Carthage as a professor of rhetoric,² apparently in 378.

The change revives his spirits ; he wins a prize for declamation ; an eminent physician, holding the office of proconsul, sets the garland on his head, and afterwards endeavours to disabuse him of his belief in astrology. Augustine is too self-satisfied to be convinced ;³ he comes out, about this time, as an author on “Beauty and Fitness ;” finds reason to question the moral consistency of the higher

¹ It is the recollection of this grief that makes him say, “ He alone loses none dear to him, to whom all are dear in Him who cannot be lost : ” Conf. iv. 14.

² Conf. iv. 12 ; v. 13.

³ Conf. iv. 6. He gave up astrology afterwards : Conf. vii. 8.

class of Manicheans,¹ and cannot see how to reconcile some parts of the system with what he knows of physical facts. "But then, Faustus," the celebrated Manichean, "is coming, and he will doubtless make all clear." Faustus comes, but with him comes disappointment. Augustine finds him only superficially learned, a ready speaker, but bad at removing difficulties,² and so gives up his notion of "going further in that sect";³ then, vexed with the unruliness of his pupils, he accepts work offered him at Rome, again associates provisionally with Manicheans, inclines to the scepticism of the Academics,⁴

¹ The "Elect." He was only a "Hearer."

² Faustus was not altogether a "quack;" he was candid enough to acknowledge ignorance on some points: *Conf. v. 12.*

³ *Conf. v. 13.*

⁴ Elsewhere he tells us that when he went to Italy he was hesitating as to what he should hold by, and what he should give up. In Italy he regretted that he had ever joined the Manicheans, but was often tempted to adopt an Agnostic position; then again, looking into the human mind, "tam vivacem, tam sagacem, tam perspicacem," he

finds Roman students, though in a meaner way, as unsatisfactory as Carthaginian,¹ and removes yet again in 384 to a similar post at Milan.

Here he resumes his old position as a catechumen in the Church, although misconceptions of the nature of its doctrine cling for a while to his mind, and it is only by degrees that he shakes them off,² and comes to see truth as well as beauty in the sermons of Milan's great bishop, St. Ambrose.

thought that truth must be discoverable, and that the way to it must be by revelation : but where was the true revelation ? Thus he wandered in a "labyrinthine wood," and his resource was to cry to Divine Providence for aid, etc. : *De Util. Cred.* 20. Further on, he says, in effect, Begin by acknowledging a God, and you will see that a revelation is to be expected, *ib.* 34 (compare Newman, *Univ. Serm.* p. 239. Liddon, *Adv. Serm.* i. 194).

¹ The "Upsetters" at Carthage were brutal to freshmen, and insolent to teachers ; the Roman students shirked paying their due fees. *Conf. v. 22.*

² *Conf. vi. 4, 18.* One was, that its notion of God was anthropomorphic : cp. *Conf. v. 20, de Mor. Eccl. Cath. 16, 17, de Beata Vita 4, Serm. 23.* For his entire change of view as to the Old Testament, see *De Util. Cred. 13.*

His widowed mother, whose fond opposition to his voyage was eluded by what he plainly calls a falsehood, crosses the sea, joins him at Milan, and finding him no longer a Manichean, expresses her confidence that he will one day become a Catholic Christian. But the process, as he describes it, is gradual ; her patience of hope is still severely tried. Slowly, if surely, he recognises the reasonableness of belief, and the spirituality of Catholic Theism ; slowly, if surely, his intellectual difficulties give way, ultimately amid the study of St. Paul's Epistles : but the moral hindrances raised by sinful habits still keep him undecided, still impel him to put off committing himself definitely to Christ's service ; as he himself says, "When arguments were confuted, a mute shrinking remained,"¹

¹ Conf. viii. 18 ; cp. ib. 2, 11. For the impression produced on him by Pontitianus' description of monastic self-devotion, and of the effect produced on two friends by the "Life of Antony," as found in a cottage near Treves, see ib. 15.

producing a severe internal conflict. At last, in a quiet Milanese garden, "when he is under a fig-tree," the series of intricate providential leadings is consummated by the grace of a victorious resolution; he hears a childish voice from the next house uttering, in a sort of chant, the words, "Take up and read;" he takes up the "volume" of St. Paul which he has brought with him, and opens it at the sentence which concludes our Epistle for Advent Sunday. "No further would I read—there was no need for more." He is "converted;" the darkness "vanishes" away.¹ He retires to a country house, lent him by a citizen of Milan, and passes the winter in the society of his mother,—his son Adeodatus, then sixteen,—his brother, two cousins, two young pupils, and his friend Alypius, who had shared in his conversion; and the books² which record their occu-

¹ Conf. viii. 29.

² See Appendix XI.

pations exhibit not only his fondness for speculative discussion, but the playful side of his character, and his thoughtful kindness in dealing with younger men.¹

On the following Easter Eve, the 24th of April, 387, in the thirty-third year of his life, Augustine was baptised with Alypius and Adeodatus. A few weeks later, when he was about to return to Africa, and five days after he and his mother, sitting at a window of a house at Ostia, had conversed on the Beatific Vision, she was attacked with a fever which

¹ We see, as it were, the “villa” of Cassisiacum, with its meadow where they walk and talk on fine days (mild, so Augustine says, for an Italian winter), and its baths where they sit in bad weather, and behind which a wooden water-pipe emits a gurgling sound. We see Monica “pushing them in” to breakfast, and sometimes taking her part well in the conversations. We are introduced to Trygetius, “a small man though a great eater,” and to the lively Virgil-loving Licentius, who lies awake at night, and slips away from breakfast, in order to make verses, but who learns to give a preference to philosophy. Once Augustine has to blame them for some levity on a sacred subject, and concludes with “Do be good fellows” (*boni estote*). They promise to be more careful: *De Ordine*, i. 30.

proved fatal. She could say her *Nunc Dimitis*; she had learned that “more things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of;” her intercessions, persistently poured forth for eleven long years,¹ had at last been abundantly answered; and she calmly expired, leaving a memory which should be dear to all who know what Christian mothers can do and can be.²

Her son’s return to Africa was for some reason postponed; soon after it took place, a seemingly incidental visit to the seaside town of Hippo Regius, “the King’s Port,”³

¹ *Conf.* v. 17; on the effect which Augustine ascribed to her prayers, see *de Ordine*, ii. 52.

² With pathetic simplicity he tells how he restrained his tears, for “hers was no unhappy death—it was indeed not death at all,”—and some thought him strangely insensible; at the very funeral his grief found no expression; he tried the effect of bathing, but he confesses to “the Father of orphans” that the weight of sorrow was not lifted until, when in bed, he recalled an evening hymn of Ambrose, thought over his mother’s pious life, “and then I could freely weep before Thee.” *Conf.* ix. 33.

³ The town stood on a flat between two elevations to the

turned out to be the opening of a signally “effectual door.” Bishop and Church people insisted on detaining him: he was ordained priest,¹ and became active as a preacher and a writer. Two years passed, and the bishop constrained him, at forty-one, to receive consecration as his coadjutor. Thus began Augustine’s episcopate, or as he himself habitually regarded it, his bearing of the “burden” of episcopal work, for a very short time as coadjutor, and afterwards as sole bishop. Many years of spiritual toil and glory lay between his consecration at the outset of the reign of Honorius, and his death amid the shocks of the Vandal invasion.

south of the modern Bona. The port was at the mouth of a river.

¹ Aug. Serm. 355. 2. “I was taken hold of, and made presbyter.” After his ordination he writes to his bishop, that there is nothing easier and more popular, “*sed nihil apud Deum miserius*,” than a perfunctory discharge of ministerial duties, while, on the other hand, nothing is more laborious, “*sed apud Deum nihil beatus, si eo modo militetur quo noster Imperator jubet* :” Ep. 21. 1.

Yet could he have foreseen, in 395, the fatal siege of 430, he would doubtless have gone to his work with as brave a spirit, with as simple a loyalty to the “sweet will of God,” as when, content to be still led on by the Hand that had brought him out of many wanderings to the true home of his soul, he bent his energies to the task of a chief pastor, and laid out his plan of episcopal life.

Can we see, through the long vista of centuries, what manner of man he was who made the bishopric of this African town so illustrious by his occupancy? He lives, we find, very simply, as head of a household of young clerics, the original and proper “Augustinians.”¹ No individual in the

¹ When he was ordained priest, he formed a little monastic society; but the community established in his episcopal house was distinct from it: see Serms. 355, 356. Persons entering this latter society, which was, in fact, a seminary, expressed their “purpose” of remaining in it, by a “profession,” also called a “promise” or “vow.” His bio-

community calls anything his own. If we like a bit of detail, silver spoons appear to be the only valuable appurtenance of that table on which are inscribed two monitory verses—

“Who at absent brethren carps with tongue unkind,
Never at this table seat again shall find.”¹

It is necessary to forbid swearing, and to punish it by forfeiture of one of the permitted draughts of wine. The bishop is intolerant of false excuses, and insists that all quarrels shall be made up before “any gift is brought to the altar.”² For himself, his occupations are so incessant as to leave him but “a very few drops of leisure.”³ Let us follow him through his

grapher says that ten of its members were “given” by Augustine as bishops to different Churches. But in one case Augustine himself put forward a young man, Antony, who all too soon proved himself unworthy : Ep. 209.

¹ Possidius, Vit. Aug. 22. When some bishops transgressed this rule, he said, “If you go on thus, either that inscription shall be effaced, or I will go instantly to my own room.”

² Ib. 25.

³ Epp. 110. 5 ; 261. 1.

routine: the ecclesiastical property requires careful administration, and his delicate sense of right refuses to accept as a bequest for the Church what ought to go to a testator's family.¹ Or there are criminals who entreat him to plead for mitigation of their sentences, according to a privilege liable to abuse, but often useful as a check on the harshness which Roman magistrates called justice.² Augustine will not intercede in all cases; when he does so, it is with a modest dignity which usually commands respect.³ Or there come before him two who have a matter in dispute, and who think they are complying with St. Paul's precept in, 1 Cor. vi. 1 ff., by asking their bishop to arbitrate between them. Sometimes he will spend the whole day in this work, endeavouring to enforce Christian principles of action, yet in his own

¹ Possidius, 24.

² Ep. 153. Cf. Bingham, ii. 8. 1.

³ Possidius, 20.

mind regretting the necessity of such deductions from the time available for higher interests.¹ In two passages he complains of the weariness of listening to angry litigants, and intimates that some speak insolently of decisions which are given against them.² Or there may be "a long train" of really or apparently contrite offenders who have to be "put to open penance;"³ but he is very loth to excommunicate, and he knows that unjust censures are not ratified above.⁴ Or there are catechumens to be instructed; and in his beautiful tract on "the Catechising of the Simple," he lets us see something of the interest and the

¹ Ib. 19. See *Enarr. in Psal. 118*, *serm. 24*. In a magnificent passage of *De Mor. Eccl. Cath. 63*, he apostrophises the Church as adding new force to every natural tie, binding slaves to masters by making their duty a pleasure, rendering masters considerate towards their slaves, and uniting citizens, nations, all men to each other, not only by a social but even by a fraternal tie, etc.

² Ep. 48. In *Ps. 118, s. 24*.

³ *Serm. 232. 7*.

⁴ See *Serm. 17. 3*; *82. 7*.

difficulty of that task; the catechist is not always in the humour, the catechumens are sometimes inattentive;¹ the method of presenting Christian truth to their half-opened minds demands real thought and tact. Then there is literary work of his own, controversial or other, not to be neglected. Any one who visited him soon after his consecration might find him writing on "The Christian Contest,"² a book which, among other things, shows that he knew how to meet Pagans in argument and carefully to discuss their objections;³ even as in later life he spent thirteen years over his great apologetic work in which the Kingdom of Christ, the "City of God," was contrasted, not with human society as such, but with the

¹ *De Cat. Rud.* 14, 19. Cp. the sermons on the "delivery" of the Creed to catechumens, and on their "repetition" of it (212-215).

² It begins, "The crown of victory is promised only to those who strive."

³ See Appendix XII.

corrupt and tottering Pagan “world.”¹ But the work dearest of all to his heart was the congenial task of preaching, which he discharged not only at or near Hippo, but wherever he was invited. The pains which he took about it, the study which he gave to it, appear in his treatise on “Christian Doctrine,” which contains truly sensible advice for all young preachers. The aim of a sermon, he says, should be to instruct, to please, and above all to move the will to action; the preacher must be determined to be understood, and for that purpose must not be too fastidious to use, on occasion, the “incorrect phrases” of the uneducated; he must pray just before he begins to preach, and must remember that inconsistency between his preaching and his conduct will be

¹ See De Pressensé in Dict. Chr. Biogr. i. 221. It is interesting to remember that Charles the Great had the “*De Civitate Dei*” read to him at his meals. Cp. Kitchin, Hist. Fr. i. 117. See Appendix XIII.

keenly observed, and turned into an excuse for careless living.¹

How deeply Augustine felt the responsibility of his pastorship, is indicated by sermons on the anniversary of his consecration, in which he asks, "Let me be helped by your prayers; it is alarming to think what I am to you as your bishop, but consoling to think what I am with you as a Christian:"² or again, "Brethren, bear my burden with me; I am but a servant, I am not the head of the household."³ Elsewhere, after repeating the passage in Ezekiel about the warning to be given to the wicked⁴— "If I keep silence, I am involved in great—I do not say peril, but—destruction; but when I have spoken and fulfilled my duty,

¹ See *De Doctr. Chr.* iv. 24, 27, 32. 60.

² *Serm. 340.* So *Enarr. in Ps. 50*, s. 13: "Magnus tremor est in docente. . . . Scit ipse qui mitescat nobis . . . cum quanto sub illo tremore ad vos loquimur."

³ *Serm. 339.*

⁴ *Ezek. xxxiii. 8.*

then do *you* look to your own peril. But what do I wish, crave, desire? Why do I speak, why do I live, save for this end, that we may together live with Christ? This is my desire, my glory, my joy, my possession. If you do not listen, I shall deliver my own soul; but I do not want to be saved without you. . . . Do not sadden me by your evil conduct, for I have no delight in this life save that you should live well.”¹ Again, by way of showing a true sympathy with his auditors, “We are called teachers, but in many things we seek a teacher, nor do we wish to be deemed masters.”² He notes every symptom of flagging attention, and makes allowance for weariness caused by hot weather or bodily infirmity;³ he is

¹ Serm. 17. So in Serm. 232: “Gaudium meum, solarium meum, et respiramentum periculorum meorum in his temptationibus nullum est, nisi bona vita vestra.”

² Serm. 23. 1.

³ He could be gently sarcastic, as on an Ascension Day, Serm. 264: “I know that on these days the church is filled

distressed about the inadequacy of his words to bring home all his meaning;¹ he looks out for the “gestures” by which his congregations would “show that they followed the preacher,” and until these tokens come, he can vary his language by words which occur to him at the moment.² He employs illustrations which might sometimes provoke a smile, which would at any rate catch the ear and stick. We hear of boys slipping off to a game that soils their hands, or crying “Peccavi” when about to be punished, or asking their father to lift them up on horseback,—of the solicitude caused in a small household by a great man’s impending

with people who think us onerous if we talk to them somewhat long, but who never feel bored if the breakfast which they are in such a hurry to get to is protracted till evening.” Once he says he had feared the *cold* weather would chill people’s desire to come to church: *In Joan. Ev. Tr. 6. 1.*

¹ *Serm. 120.*

² See *De Doctr. Chr. iv. 25.* Such variations, he says, are impossible for those who can only repeat what they have committed to memory.

visit,—of toils endured in the chase of boars or stags,—very often of the beneficial severity of surgical operations. He takes advantage of the psalm just sung, of the lesson just read, of the “*Sursum corda*” at the Eucharist, of the white robe of baptism, of the Paschal Alleluia.¹ His sermons, among which must be included his expository discourses on St. John, and on the Psalter, show the lively versatility of his mind: one finds, as it were, almost everything in them; here a discussion of Old Testament questions, or of sceptical difficulties;² here a confutation of this or that current heterodoxy; here a reference to the remnants of Paganism still found in a Christianised province.³ Exact theological distinctions, such as that the Son of God,

¹ In one case, when the deacon, by his desire, has read a passage, he himself takes the book and reads it out again: Serm. 356. 1.

² E.g. Serm. 51.

³ E.g. Serm. 62.

on coming into the world, did not cease to "abide" with the Father, or that the crucifixion and burial which are predicated of the whole Christ were endured by Him only in His manhood,¹ are not more natural to this "instructed scribe" than exact moral distinctions between various degrees of sin, from the first inclination of the will in an evil direction to the fully confirmed evil habit.² He has observed rapid improvements of character, and also speedy deteriorations ;³ he dwells on "little sins," so called, as forming in time a huge heap ; he exposes the evasiveness of the plea, "I am not breaking a commandment in the letter."⁴ His people must have felt that in him they had a thoroughly real preacher, and that his

¹ Serm. 28, 186, 214.

² Serm. 98. 6. Very characteristically in Serm. 213, after stating accurately the doctrine of the Trinity, he adds, "May the Trinity deliver us from the multitude of sins!"

³ Serm. 46. 27.

⁴ Serm. 9.

object was truly represented by the prayer which he used after sermons, "Let us turn with a pure heart to the Lord our God, the Father Almighty, and render him abundant thanks, beseeching him to hear our prayers, to drive away the enemy from our acts and thoughts, to increase our faith, direct our minds, grant us spiritual thoughts, and bring us to His blessedness, through Jesus Christ His Son our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with Him in the unity of the Holy Spirit, God throughout all ages of ages."¹ And the depth and richness of his capacity as a teacher are indicated by condensed sayings, —passion and thought, as Bishop Alexander expresses it, "packed in epigram," sometimes grasping the memory by a rhyme, sometimes brightly antithetical,—sometimes tender, as, "Love, and then do what thou wilt;"² sometimes sublime, as, "Join thy heart to God's eternity."³

¹ Serm. 34. 9.

² In Ep. Jo. 7. S.

³ In Ps. 91.

We may now briefly endeavour to see what can be learned from Augustine's treatment of the three controversies,¹ in which it was his lot to be principally engaged.

1. And first, without plunging into the mazes of what Augustine calls the "Persian tale,"² traceable to Mani, of which something has been already said, we may observe that it should interest us, not merely on account of its revival among the sects of the twelfth century, but because traces of its influence may be found in those diverse lines of thought which deny, in effect, that matter has been sanctified by the "Holy Incarnation." Augustine's polemic against the system which had allured him in early manhood

¹ Not reckoning the Arian question, on which he wrote in 418 and 427-8. His great work on the Trinity was in hand for many years. See Appendix XIV.

² *De Util. Cred.* 36; *c. Secundin.* 2. "Most false," but also "most deceptive." The illusory use of Christian language he describes as "an ornamental door," a "snare," a "bait," a "veil :" *c. Epist. Man.* 12; *Conf.* iii. 10; *c. Faust.* xxii. 13, 16.

was a contribution to the cause of Theism against Pantheism, and of Monotheism against Dualism. When persons had come to think that their own souls were portions of the Divine substance,¹ emanations from the supremely "Good" Being² imprisoned in bodies which, as material, were derived from an eternally evil source,³ they were profoundly alienated from the very root-principles of religion, not to say of Christianity.

¹ Conf. iv. 26, vii. 3. Act. cum Felice, ii. 20; c. Faust. v. 7.

² Mani calls Him "God the Father;" c. Epist. Man. 16. Faustus calls Him "God the Father Almighty," and says that He dwells in the highest light, His Son in the second or visible light, the Holy Spirit, as "the third majesty," in the air: c. Faust. xx. 2.

³ This enthralment was traced to a conflict between the kingdoms of light and of darkness or matter: c. Fortunat. 1; c. Faust. vi. 8. On the process of releasing the imprisoned particles of "light," see c. Faust. ii. 5 (where, however, for "Christ" should be substituted "Jesus," the Holy Name being given by Manicheans to these particles, the extraction of which was called "suffering," ib. vi. 4, xx. 2). "The one duty of a Manichean was to avoid confining the substance of God in matter, or to release it;" Pusey on the Confessions, p. 328. Augustine sometimes indulges in grim humour on this subject: c. Faust. vi. 4; De Mor. Man. 40.

It was necessary to remind them of the sovereign oneness and the incommunicable prerogatives of Deity, and to point out that moral responsibility was inseparably attached to the soul of man, which could never excuse its own divergences from goodness by referring them to its contact with the evil of a material body. It was easy enough to call sin a mere result of this unnatural confinement of the ethereal substance in the flesh. But Augustine had to drive home the conviction that sin was an act of the “I,” the conscious moral self:¹ and this is worth remembering when a “physical theory of sin” would make vice or crime a mere result of antecedent conditions. Again, whereas the Manichean spoke of his God as if, after all, he were material in nature,² and adopted Christian language about the “redemption” and resto-

¹ See *Conf.* iv. 26, v. 18, vii. 5; c. *Fortunat.* 17.

² See *De Util. Cred.* 36; c. *Epist. Man.* 20.

ration of mankind as the mask of a radically physical conception,¹ Augustine had to vindicate the supreme importance of what was moral and spiritual, and to reclaim for Christianity its own right to its own sacred terms ; and this is not uninstructive for those who see the physical order not seldom exalted above the moral, and religious phrases calmly misused in this or that non-religious sense. When Manicheism attracted proselytes by promising to give them knowledge of matters on which Christianity was silent, or on which it bade them walk by faith,² Augustine, drawing, as always, from the stores of his own experience, insisted that the soul's

¹ Pusey on the *Confessions*, pp. 327, 333.

² *Conf.* v. 12 : *De Actis cum Felice*, i. 9 ; Paul, says Felix, knew but in part ; Manichæus came, and taught us about the structure of the world, etc., cp. c. *Epist. Man.* 14. But the most attractive offer of Manicheans was, "We can explain to you the origin of evil," *Conf.* iii. 12 ; *De Duabus Animabus*, 10. On the pictures offered to fancy, see c. *Faust.* xv. 6. It should be remembered that Mani himself was a skilful draughtsman.

supreme need was to know God, maintained that "trust" was a reasonable principle,¹ and retorted by enlarging on the fantastic absurdities² of a system which, indeed, appears in many respects so extravagant that we hardly understand how its advocates could venture to sneer at Christians as the credulous slaves of dogma.³ And although a good deal in the long treatise "Against Faustus" is occupied with the refutation of what seems to us wild nonsense, we find ourselves in very modern air when we see how Faustus disparaged Gospel narratives, and taunted those whom he was pleased to call "Judaic semi-

¹ See the *De Util. Cred.* in which faith is represented (1) as different from credulity, (2) as serving a moral end; and *De Fide Rerum quæ non videntur*, 4.

² Cp. *Conf.* vi. 7, and *c. Epist. Man.* 19.

³ "Tu qui temere omnia credis, qui naturæ beneficium, rationem, ex hominibus damnas :" Faustus in *Aug. c. Faust.* xviii. 3. For Augustine's own protest against any disparagement of reason, see *ib.* 7, *Epist.* 120. 3. In *De Vera Relig.* 45, he says that what we first accept by faith we come to appreciate by reason.

Christians" with "knowing Christ only after the flesh,"¹ with reducing Christian duty to a mere belief in an alleged miraculous fact;² when he treated the Crucifixion as the symbol of an idea,³ and set aside the accounts of the Nativity and the Circumcision, the Baptism and the Temptation, and the references to the Old Testament, as post-Apostolic interpolations or mis-statements,⁴ insomuch that Augustine could charge him with claiming for any individual the right to accept or reject any passage in the New Testament on purely subjective grounds. We may remember how Dr. Mozley, with his peculiar combination of humour and keenness, repre-

¹ C. Faust. xi. 1. He held that in 2 Cor. v. 16, St. Paul was retracting an earlier and "carnal" opinion.

² C. Faust. v. 3.

³ C. Faust. xxxii. 7. Cp. Secundinus, Ep. to Aug. 4.

⁴ C. Faust. xi. 2, xxxii. 2, 7, 19, etc. He was particularly severe on the two genealogies: they were at variance with each other, and with the second and fourth Gospels, etc.: ib. iii. 1, vii. 1. On Manichean assumptions as to corruption of the New Testament text, see De Mor. Eccl. Cath. 61; De Mor. Man. 35.

sents the Manichean as trying to persuade the Christian to give up the “discreditable” Hebrew patriarchs, and as treating them with the insolence of a vulgar free-thinker.¹ And Faustus’ eclectic free handling of the New Testament was combined with an utter rejection of the Old;² as for evidence from the Prophets in favour of Christianity, he held that it simply did not exist, and that, had it existed, it would have been rather damaging than helpful.³

It was, then, work done for all time when Augustine insisted on the reality of the Incarnation as the very basis of Christian faith,

¹ Mozley, *Ruling Ideas in Early Ages*, p. 267; see c. Faust. xxii. 3-5, xxxiii. 1, 3; Conf. iii. 13.

² “Respuimus Vetus Testamentum . . . Hebraeorum Dei et nostri admodum diversa conditio est.” Faustus in c. Faust. xv. 1. So Augustine had said that Manicheans misled weak Christians by vituperating the Old Testament, De Gen. c. Man. i. 2; and see De Util. Cred. 13.

³ C. Faust. xii. 1. He professes to have read the prophets attentively, and to have found in them nothing about Christ. Then he assails their character.

laid stress upon its sacramental energy, defended the continuity of the two economies, pointed out that the Gospel had its own stern aspects,¹ and anticipated the now familiar argument that commands intended for an imperfect stage of moral development would involve a certain amount of moral accommodation.² In his warfare, then, against Manicheism, Augustine did lasting service to true religion, although here and there—as when he asserts the actual “nullity” of evil—he may take up a position which seems at first sight satisfactory, but affords no permanent foothold.³ One paragraph of his tract “Against the Epistle of Manichæus” is precious as an admonition to all controversialists who might be tempted to forget charity and equity. “Let *those* be fierce against you,” he exclaims,

¹ C. Adimant. 13; c. Adversarium Legis, i. 29. So in an earlier work, De Vera Relig. 34.

² C. Faust. xxii. 77; cp. Conf. iii. 13.

³ See Appendix XV.

“who know not with what toil the truth is discovered—with what difficulty the eye of the inner man is made sound—what signs and groans it costs even in ever so small a degree to understand God !”¹

2. Donatism, against which, as the harassing trouble of the Church in Africa, Augustine had to contend during the earlier years of his episcopate, is at once a repulsive and an interesting phenomenon. It is repulsive because of the extraordinary stubbornness, unreasonableness, and violence of the Donatist party as a whole, not to say the wild tumultuous ferocity, in some cases the fiendish cruelty displayed by its roughest adherents,

¹ C. Epist. Man. 2. Further on, ib. 29, he breaks forth into a pathetic exhortation and prayer: “Consider for a little, without animosity and bitterness; we are all men; let us hate, not one another, but errors and falsities. Pray consider a little. God of mercies, help them while they consider, and light up their minds while they seek the truth !” Cp. also the beautiful intercession, containing the words from Ezek. xxxiii. 11 which occur in our Third Collect for Good Friday, in *De Natura Boni*, 48.

the “Circumcellions,” or “Hut-rangers,” in partisan phrase termed “Combatants,” with their bludgeons called “Israels,” and their dreaded shout of “Praises to God.”¹ It is interesting because, below all this coarse and dogged fanaticism, there was in the better Donatists a real zeal for Christian purity and strictness, a passionate desire to keep the Kingdom of God from being corrupted by the spirit of the world; and because a like desire may be discerned in several modern sects, which have put their own crude glosses on the maxim, “Be ye separate.” For our present purpose we may put aside the question of fact which recurs in every

¹ Augustine repeatedly dwells on the ruffianism of these fanatics, whom in one place he calls the “teeth and heels” of their party (c. Crescon. iii. 69). The moderate Donatists said, “We disapprove of these excesses, but we cannot prevent them, we have to bear with them:” c. Litt. Petil. i. 26. The Donatist bishop at Hippo boldly rebuked them through an interpreter who could speak Punic: Epist. 108. 14. Their violence was originally connected with hostility to social order: Epist. 185. 15.

document relating to this sect, and not concern ourselves with the inquiries made under Constantine as to whether Felix, the consecrator of Cæcilian, bishop of Carthage, had compromised his fidelity by delivering up the sacred books in the persecution,—that is, whether the succession of the Carthaginian episcopate was really traceable to a “Traditor.” In point of fact, the charge had long before been proved to be based on a gross forgery.¹ But the question of principle, and the motives of those who raised it, are a very different matter. Let us take the latter point first: What was the ideal which Donatism proposed to itself? The same which several other sects in our own country and elsewhere have pursued; namely, to realise in this world the description of the Church as not having spot or blemish. What men felt, we may suppose, was something

¹ See Appendix XVI.

to this effect:—“Christianity is becoming popular. This may seem a strength, but is really a weakness. A crowd of half-converts will lower the tone of the Christian body; the stream will be contaminated while it broadens. We must resist the temptation to relax discipline for the sake of numbers, to gain extension at the cost of becoming secularised. Before all things, we must have a pure Church—a Church which can be literally ‘holy,’ and therefore morally and intrinsically ‘one.’”¹ Such a view would be attractive to many pious minds, and would claim sympathetic and respectful treatment. It was flawed, however, by an impatient idealism; and Augustine had to dwell on the inevitable conditions under which, in a world so “subject to vanity,” the Divine kingdom had to work. Immaculate sanctity was not to be the possession of its members during

¹ See Gest. Collat. iii. 258, in Mansi, Concil. iv. 236.

a pilgrimage which involved such close neighbourhood with evil; the bad fish must lie in the net beside the good, the tares must grow in the field among the wheat,¹ until the great day of final discrimination. True, our Lord had explained "the field" to mean "the world;" but in the context of this parable of the Kingdom, it was clear that by "the world" was meant humanity evangelised.² In urging this he taught those who would listen to beware of simplifying Scriptural statements in the interest of a seemingly pious theory; he reminded them of the restrictions under which the power of good had to operate, and of the mark of Catholicity which must be combined with that of sanctity in defining the character of the Church of Christ. It was well enough to quote such

¹ Aug. Psalm. c. Part. Don. 10, 177; Ep. 43. 21. He urges on this ground that corruptions, abuses, scandals, give no excuse for separation from the Church.

² Aug. ad Don. post Coll. 11; he quotes Cyprian (Ep. 54) as so understanding it. Comp. Brevic. Coll. 15.

texts as “Touch not the unclean thing,” to urge the duty of separating the precious from the vile, to ask whether all censure of vice or sin was to be deemed needless or inappropriate: the answer was, “Undoubtedly discipline must be exercised,¹ but you must not expect too much of result from it; and you *do* expect more than it can achieve, when you say that it must eject all manifest evil. That is beyond the possibilities of the case; experience may show that wholesale excommunication would do more harm than good, and you yourselves must needs admit that you have men of bad character among you.² The faithful servant of Christ can do much by his example, and can keep himself from being a partaker in other men’s sins; but he cannot be exempt from the trial involved in

¹ C. Ep. Parmen. iii. 13; c. Litt. Petil. iii. 5, 43.

² E.g. in Psal. c. Part. Don.: “Multos nunc habetis pravos qui vobis displicent valde, Nec tamen hos separatis a vestra communione;” and c. Ep. Parm. ii. 6.

the presence of many who are not one with the Church in spirit, not really 'of' her, though for the time within her pale."¹

Again, a momentous principle was put by Augustine into clearer form than it had ever previously received. Admitting, for the sake of argument, what he denied in fact, that this or that bishop on the Catholic side had been involved in the guilt of "betrayal,"² or granting that Catholic ministers had been involved in this or that moral blameworthiness, he maintained that such faults or sins on the part of the priest could not vitiate the sacraments which he administered, for the simple but deeply significant reason that he was but the organ of the ever-present and never-failing Bestower of grace, the true though invisible Dispenser of ordinances, "whose Divine power is always present with

¹ See Appendix XVII.

² See Ep. 185. 4; ad Don. post Coll. 4, etc.

His sacrament," "who Himself consecrates His sacrament," "who is Himself the Baptiser,"¹ and, we may add, Himself the Celebrant, Confirmer, Absolver, Ordainer. It was surely worth a great deal to get this idea luminously worked out: when once it is really apprehended, one main objection to what is called "sacerdotalism" is seen to be based on a pure misconception, to be irrelevant to the principle that "the Church or her ministers are *not instead of, but the instruments of*, Christ."²

As Augustine thus maintained the proposition which was afterwards rejected by Lollards and Anabaptists, and affirmed in our Twenty-sixth "Article," so he freely recognised the validity of Donatist baptism, although he considered its virtue to be suspended by continuance in schism.³ "We

¹ See Appendix XVIII.

² Pusey, Serm. on Entire Absolution, p. 5. Cp. Bp. Wilson, *Sacra Privata*, Wednesday.

³ See the passages in *De Bapt.* i. 18, iii. 18.

will not," he said, "insult God's sacrament in your persons."¹ He recognised the sufficiency of the "desire" of baptism where the sacrament could not be had;² he would not call a man a "heretic" who erred under misapprehension;³ and, although he unfortunately admitted, to some extent, the principle of penal legislation, and gave up his original opinion that nothing but persuasion should be used against sectarians,⁴—although, that is, he lent his name to a view of the State's duty which was afterwards carried out in systematic persecution,—we must

¹ C. Litt. Petil. ii. 69. So Ep. 93. 46, "You are with us in baptism, in the creed, in the other sacraments of the Lord; but *not* in the spirit of unity, not in the Catholic Church."

² De Bapt. iv. 29. He follows Ambrose.

³ De Bapt. iv. 23.

⁴ He was unhappily led to think that penal laws had been a wholesome stimulant, promoting return to Church unity: and his defence of such laws involved a strange confusion between providential and merely human penalties, and between moral and physical "pressure." In Ep. 93. 5, he misuses Luke xiv. 23; cp. Ep. 185. 24. Athanasius condemns persecution on principle, Hist. Ari. 33.

make allowance for the provocation given by persistent outrages on the part of the fiercer Donatists, and take account also of his pleadings for fair play at the conference held between the two parties,—of his earnestness in deprecating extreme severities in requital of such crimes as the murder of one of his own priests,—of his willingness to be blamed by some Churchmen as the advocate of “excessive forbearance,”—and of his touching exhortation to converts from Donatism to “abound in tenderness, and to pray for those who were still out of temper, that the long contracted infirmity of the carnal mind in them might be healed.”¹

3. But Augustine is best remembered, as a controversialist, in connection with the great Pelagian heresy, which denied grace in the

¹ Cp. Ep. 133. 2; 139. 2; 142. 4; and Serm. 359. 7, on the conversion of Donatists, ‘ Resistebamus . . . et tamen amabamus.’

proper sense, because it denied original sin. What was the importance of the question thus raised?

In the first place, and speaking generally, Pelagianism was a backward step towards the non-Christian position. In this respect it resembled Arianism. It retained the ordinary Christian phrases on the subject of sin and grace, but it associated them with what was virtually Naturalism. Very instructive it is to observe that Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, who had been a friend of Chrysostom's, and who became, in fact, the father of that Nestorian heresy which substituted for the doctrine of the Incarnation a theory of mere association between the Son of God and the Son of Man, was himself the anticipator of Pelagius. An inadequate conception of Christ's Person might suggest an inadequate conception of the nature of His work. Grant the Incar-

nation, and the idea of redemption from an immense ruin—of a vast human need to be supplied by a vast spiritual force—follows naturally; deny it in effect, if not in terms, and the Catholic view of the Fall and of grace must needs seem exaggerated and unreal. Other minds might take the reverse order: “the Nestorian Christ” might be deemed “the fitting Saviour of the Pelagian man;”¹ and a very bold disciple of Pelagius was led to deny the entire freedom of Christ’s soul from sinful impulses.² But even where Pelagianism co-existed, as apparently in Pelagius himself, with a very orthodox conception of the Redeemer’s Divine Person, it necessarily narrowed the scope of His merciful operations; it minimised, so to speak, the soul’s obligation to Him. It encouraged men to seek for moral renova-

¹ Ch. Quart. Review, xvi. 298.

² See Aug. Op. imperf. c. Julian. iv. 40.

tion "through the channel of their original constitution,"¹ instead of looking to a communication of Divine life from Christ as the re-creating Word. And to us the study of Pelagianism should be the more interesting on account of the existence of a Pelagianism adapted to our own day, which recognises Christ as a type of moral excellence, as a spiritual hero and pattern, but fails to see in Him, as it has been admirably expressed, "a higher Divine personality enclosing our own, an abiding reality of holy Will, not merely attracting our wills, but moving them from within, at once a light above us and a strength within us, transforming us, however faintly, to its own lustre and purity."² This

¹ Wilberforce on Doctr. of Baptism, p. 165.

² Tulloch, in Good Words for 1879, p. 142. He goes on to dwell on the insufficiency of "moral idealism." which would substitute for the living Christ "a self-creation of our own aspirations," etc.

temper of mind, which consistently puts forward a conception of Christian morality as but slightly indebted to grace,—which therefore inevitably tends to reduce that morality from the Gospel standard of holiness to the social standard of virtue, as if it meant little more than justice, kindness, and temperance,—which is jealous of anything that seems “mystical,” and aims at keeping the supernatural element of Christian life within such narrow limits as hardly leave it room to operate,—which presents itself as a method for making Christianity more palatable to outsiders, and virtually appeals to the uninformed self-confidence, the impatience of great spiritual ideas, and the imperfect appreciation of Christ’s work, or even of His personality, which characterise our popular individualism,—may represent to us, with a fair amount of clearness, the practical

bearings of the old fifth-century controversy.¹

But as to its particular features ; the original proposition of Pelagianism was that man did not need, and God did not give, grace in any fuller sense than that of the natural capacity of freewill, or of a reinforcement of that capacity, or of illumination as to duty, and instruction by Divine precept or by Christ's example, or of the grant of remission of sins, or the like.² Pelagians were fluent enough in acknowledging "grace" in any of these senses. But a special supernatural movement of Divine power acting on the will and invigorating it for good,—a real energy of the Holy Spirit supplying the deficiencies of nature, "warming the affections, bracing the will,"³ and uniting the

¹ See also Newman's Sermons, v. 135.

² See Appendix XIX.

³ Liddon, Christmastide Serm. p. 217. Cp. Döllinger, First Age of the Church, E.T., p. 191. It is always

recipient to the life-giving manhood of Him “in whom all fulness dwelleth,”—this was to the Pelagian an unreality, imagined without evidence and without need, and likely enough to do harm to moral interests, by encouraging an indolence which shrank from efforts after goodness, and excused itself by exaggerating the infirmity of human nature. “You can serve God by your own natural moral force, which is itself the gift of His creative mercy; to pray, ‘Give me the power to obey Thy commands,’ when you have that power already, is faithless sloth in a pious disguise; bestir yourself, set your will in motion, and do not mock God by asking Him to do your proper work.” Such, at any rate, was the feeling of Pelagius.¹ We

necessary to remember that “the infusion of grace” is merely a convenient theological expression for the personal action of the Divine Paraclete.

¹ Hence Pelagius was shocked when he heard a bishop quote from the Confessions (x. 40), “Give what Thou commandest, and then command what Thou wilt!” See De

must give him credit for a genuine interest in the promotion of virtue; he believed that the power of the will was being disparaged with mischievous results; he thought that to say it needed a supernatural stimulus was to confirm a passivity which might end in a fatal torpor. But in his zeal against a false humility, he was blind to his own want of the true: and, moreover, his view of the will was that of a theorist, narrow and superficial; he did not take account of a whole class of facts which a deeper experience of life and its temptations would have brought home to correct his over-simple statement

Dono Persev. 53. Cp. also Pelagius' letter to Demetrias, 16 (in App. to Aug. Epp.), where he denounces false excuses for moral indolence, such as, "It is too hard, we are but human,—*fragili carne circumdamur*." "As if," he exclaims, "God had laid on man commands which he could not endure," etc. Hence the somewhat tedious discussions with Pelagians as to the possibility or the actuality of entire "freedom from sin," in which it became obvious that their idea of such moral perfection was commonplace and unspiritual.

of the problem; and so, as by a "nemesis," a theory which started under a moral impetus resulted in a lowered standard of goodness and a weakened perception of sin.¹ This came of ignoring the fact that disease was present alike in all parts of the inward being; that not only did the conscience require to be illuminated, but the affections needed to be cleansed and elevated, and the will was in want of a quickening and invigorating touch, which must come from the Holy Spirit, as shed abroad from Christ within the soul.

And this brings us to the second head of Pelagian doctrine, which, in fact, supplied the rationale of the first. The denial of the need of real grace was justified by the denial of the existence of inherited corruption. Thus the two propositions were made to cohere. Pelagianism directly traversed

¹ Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. of Predestination*, pp. 64, 104-106.

the assertion of the requirement of special Divine assistance, outside the resources of the natural man, by saying that humanity had not been enfeebled by a Fall. So the ground was cleared; so the two views intelligibly confronted one another. “We *do not* want what you call grace, because our nature has not lost the righteousness in which it was created.” “We *do* want grace, and that as the initiating principle of all good in us, inspiring and ‘exciting,’ communicating the needful impulse; we want it because our nature lost that righteousness in the fall of Adam, and thereby contracted a taint, a warp, a bias towards evil, a transmissible element of weakness and perversity.” Here, again, it was the Pelagian who took a limited view of the case, it was the Catholic who looked at facts all round. “Who,” it has been asked, “can deny, as a matter of fact, the existence of such a thing as

original or birth-sin,”¹ however inexact the phrase may be to describe the tendency, “observable from the very moment of dawning reason,” to the gratification of the principle of self-will, a term which of itself bears witness to the twist which the will has somehow received, and which, on the principle of “heredity,” is reasonably explained by a transmission of moral taint from the first ancestor? And so it has been said that the doctrine of the Fall is “at once the most obscure and the most illuminating of mysteries;”² and we may remember how Browning puts foremost among the “reasons and reasons” for thinking Christianity true, that—

“ ’Tis the faith which launched point-blank its dart
At the head of a lie,—taught original sin,
The corruption of man’s heart.”

¹ Wace, Christianity and Morality, p. 82; cp. Mozley’s Lectures, p. 138.

² Paget, Faculties and Difficulties for Belief and Unbelief, p. 192; cp. Liddon, Advent Sermons, i. 211, and an eloquent passage on the “gains and the losses of heredity” in Holland’s Creed and Character, pp. 146–150.

It would be easy to enlarge upon this point; but let what has been said suffice to show that if the two Pelagian propositions had not been challenged, and driven out of the domain of “Churchly” thought, Christianity would have “sunk to an inferior religion,”¹ on all that side of it which dealt with the relation of man to God; it would have lost its vitalising power.

A spiritual guide, exceptionally loved and honoured,² has observed that “lives which have recovered from some serious ‘dislocation’ are often thenceforward filled with a special energy and fire of the Spirit.” Experience of the far country, perhaps of the swine’s food, gives peculiar urgency to pleadings against wilfulness; it makes sin seem more exceeding sinful, and deepens the sense of dependence on the Hand that can purify

¹ Mozley on Aug. Doctr. of Predestination, p. 106.

² The present Bishop of Lincoln, in an address delivered at Oxford.

and restore. It was so, doubtless, with Augustine. He who had been the lost and was found, who had pined in spiritual famine, been "wild with spiritual thirst,"¹ and had been satisfied,—who had been, as he expresses it, "rent piecemeal,"² and had regained moral wholeness, could not fail to be stirred with a passion of zeal against theories which encouraged men to minimise their disease and underrate the Divinely offered remedy.³ But while he successfully maintained the truths which Pelagianism had put in peril, he yet impaired the helpfulness of his teaching by exaggerations which have had lamentable results. It is not too much to say that his early wanderings from the path were the original source of what is unsatisfactory, as well as of what is admirable in his polemic. The conversion which closed them

¹ Cf. Conf. iii. 1; Newman, Church of the Fathers, p. 155.

² Conf. ii. 1.

³ De Nat. et Grat. 76, etc.

had burned into his mind an intense conviction of the Divine sovereignty, as exhibited in the operations of grace. It was God who had overruled his waywardness,¹ had ordered his transit from Thagaste to Carthage, from Carthage to Rome, from Rome to Milan,—had willed that he should be wholesomely disappointed in Faustus, had provided the opportunities involved in momentous conversations,² had led him by paths which he had not known,³ had never intermitted the manifold guidance, the “strong and patient” and resourceful discipline, which had brought him, at last, to the feet of his Redeemer. “Surely,” he would say, “it is God who has done it all.” The Divine side of the work of salvation

¹ The Confessions are all addressed to God.

² *E.g.* with Simplicianus about the open confession of faith by Victorinus, Conf. viii. 3; and with Pontitianus, as already referred to.

³ See Conf. v. 11, 13-15, 23; vii. 12.

became, to his gaze, altogether predominant ; the study of that Epistle to the Romans which had struck, for him, the right chord at the right moment, gradually led him to think of the Divine Will as in no respect self-limited, as absolutely selecting from “the mass” of souls condemned in Adam some favoured objects of a saving predestination, and mysteriously but justly abandoning the rest,¹ and as working so mightily in the elect as not merely to stimulate, initiate, and sustain right action, but to insure it by a grace

¹ This is fully brought out in the famous letter to Sixtus, Ep. 194 ; cp. also Ep. 186. 19 ff. The word “massa” was taken from a Latin version of Rom. ix. 21. Elsewhere, as *De Correptione et Grat.* 12, he uses the other rendering “*conspersio*.” A frequent phrase with him is “*massa perditionis*.” For a very strong statement of predestinarianism see *De Dono Persev.* 35, and *c. Jul. v.* 14. The “*Enchiridion* also contains this stern doctrine, but it “began to be specially developed,” says Tillemont (xiii. 878) in the “*De Correptione et Gratia*,” which was written in 427, and followed up by the “*De Praedestinatione Sanctorum*” and “*De Dono Perseverantiae*.” The condition of the non-elect is repeatedly expressed by negatives : “those whom God does *not* draw, —does *not* teach, —who are *not* set free, who do *not* receive.”

that should master and control ¹ the recipient, so that he could not but comply with its inspirations. The vision of such a Will and such a Power appeared to fill the whole scene: “Was it,” he would ask, “for man to question the right of the sole Arbiter? As little as for the clay to resist the potter’s hand. What could be said but, ‘So He wills it, and what He wills must assuredly come to pass?’ Piety could but fall back on the ‘depth’ of Divine counsels, the ‘unsearchableness of Divine judgments.’”² It was thus that Augustine’s idea of religious dutifulness became too exclusively connected with a view of the “decrees” to which he gave somewhat hesitating expression about twelve years before the rise of Pelagianism;³ but

¹ See *Christian Remembrancer*, Jan. 1856, p. 158.

² *E.g.* C. Duas Ep. Pelag. iv. 16; *de Grat. et Lib. Arb.* 44.

³ *De Div. Quæst. ad Simplician.* i. 16; cp. Mozley, *Doctr. of Predest.* p. 134. When, three years earlier, he wrote his *Exposition of some passages in the Epistle to the Romans*, he had made election depend on foresight of human

it would be equally unfair to say that his whole line of opposition for Pelagianism was determined by and dependent on that view, and to trace it, as Pelagians did, to remnants of that Manichean idea of corruption which was, in fact, physical rather than moral, and which denied the creation, as such, to be "good."¹ Augustine's anti-Pelagian arguments rested partly on distinct Scriptural statements, partly on the general Christian doctrine of redemption and mediation as involving a re-creation, in the Second Adam,² of a nature depraved through the fall of the first. They might almost be represented by his frequent contention that Pelagianism "made the Cross of none effect."³ But in

character (c. 61). Writing in 428 or 429, he referred to this as a mistaken notion which he had held before he became a bishop : *De Præd. Sanct.* 7.

¹ See Aug. *c. Duas Ep. Pelag.* ii. 2, iii. 25, iv. 4; *Op. imperf.* iii. 37.

² *E.g. De Pecc. Orig.* 28.

³ *De Nat. et Grat.* 6, 26, 47, 58.

regard to original sin, Augustine went too far for us to follow him when he used language which would suggest an actual imputation of Adam's personal guilt to his posterity;¹ when, in forgetfulness of that Divine equity which in other cases he could recognise, he treated the ordinary baptismal remedy for the inborn taint or disease as absolutely indispensable; or when, under pressure of controversy, he denied what the Alexandrians had been strong in asserting, the existence of real goodness among the heathen as a product of the influence of the Word.² And in regard to grace, while he was thoroughly right in affirming as against

¹ On this, see Döllinger, First Age of the Church, E.T., p. 177. Augustine relied on an erroneous Latin rendering of Rom. v. 12, "In quo omnes peccaverunt;" and Julian was able to correct him by saying that ἐφ' ἡμῖν meant "inasmuch as:" c. Jul. vi. 75. But that the idea of the passage is, "all sinned through one man,"—that Adam's fall compromised the race,—see Gifford *in loc.*, and Trench on St. Augustine as an Interpreter of Scripture, p. 125.

² C. Jul. v. 17.

the Semi-Pelagians,¹ what at one time he himself had not understood,² that it must come in at the very outset as “prevenient” and originative, as “exciting” and thereby empowering, he nevertheless went beyond his warrant when he virtually treated it as determining that due response which, according to really Catholic doctrine, it only renders possible; on which supposition the “freedom” produced by grace would be, in fact, a “blessed necessity” of goodness, incompatible with a state of moral

¹ See Appendix XX.

² Mozley argues that irresistible grace is substantially asserted not only in Augustine’s “*De Correptione et Grat.*,” (6, 17, 31, 34, 38), but in the “*De Gratia Christi*,” and even in a passage of the yet earlier “*De Spiritu et Littera*” (c. 60); see *Doctr. of Predest.* pp. 159, 241. It has been said that if grace is *not* irresistible, the will’s consent is independent, and comes, in fact, from “nature;” but grace, by the supposition, is necessary to make consent possible; the consent is the using of the ability which grace imparts, and, as such, is the requisite action of moral personality. Another instance in which Augustine corrects a former opinion of his own, is in *De Civ. Dei*, xx. 7, where he says that he once held the spiritual form of Millenarianism.

probation. In several passages Augustine thus represents the consent of the will to the motions of grace as simply receptive of a gift which cannot be refused ; "freewill" with him means less than it should, and Divine "assistance" more ;¹—and the words "make" and "work" are pressed with such imperative literalism² as to suggest the later technical use of "efficacious grace" in the sense of "irresistible," that very sense condemned by the Council of Trent, and imputed to Jansen in the second of the "Five Propositions."³ Thus far, it seems too plain that Augustine's absolutism of language disturbed the relation of the two elements in that

¹ While he strained such texts as Eph. ii. 10 or Phil. ii. 13, he explained away 1 Tim. ii. 4; c. Jul. iv. 42, de Corr. et Gr. 44. In an earlier work, *De Lib. Arbit.* iii. 7, 8, he had insisted that real volition was absolutely involved in the will; that a will not free was not a will; that it was *as* free that the human will was the object of Divine prescience.

² *E.g.* Ep. 217.

³ See Appendix XXI.

process which unites the soul morally to its God.

On these subjects, then, our choice does not lie between Augustinianism, fully developed, and Pelagianism, whether modified or unmodified. We go with this great teacher to a certain point, and then, without any inconsistency, stop short, as we do in regard to his predestinarianism, which obscured in too many minds the precious truth affirmed, about a century after his death, by the illustrious Council of Orange, in harmony with the essential principle of grace,—that salvation is really offered, in Christ, to all the baptised.¹ In his own lifetime, his impatience of qualifications, of balance, and of parallelism, in his favourite department of theology,

¹ "This also we believe according to the Catholic faith, that all the baptised, having received grace through baptism, are, if willing to labour faithfully, both able and bound to fulfil, by Christ's aid and co-operation, what pertains to the salvation of the soul." See the writer's Anti-Pelagian Treatises of St. Augustine, p. 391.

proved in several cases a stumbling-block. More moderate language on his part might have spared Julian of Eclanum those shocks to the sense of Divine justice which made his Pelagianism so passionate and intense,¹ and might also have kept the leading Churchmen of Southern Gaul from ascribing the first act of faith to the will as unassisted, by way of securing a sphere for human responsibility.² Augustine was, in a sense, answerable for their Semi-Pelagianism. In after days the authority of his predestinarianism gave occasion, not only to Gottschalk in the ninth century, but to Calvin in the sixteenth;³

¹ *E.g.* Op. Imp. c. Jul. i. 28.

² What they should have said was, “Grace is prevenient, but is not irresistible; it gives the necessary first impulse, but what is thus offered can be refused, and the will has a real part in its acceptance.”

³ See Hardwick on the Articles, p. 161: *Christ. Remembr.*, Jan. 1856, p. 175. Augustine did not say that the non-elect were predestined to condemnation; and he did hold what Calvinism, properly speaking, denied, that there could be a real work of grace for the time in persons who, as non-elect, would not ultimately persevere: *De Corr. et Grat.* 18; *de*

although in mere fairness it must be added that Calvinism relentlessly accentuates the sternest tones of his stern theory, while refusing the corrective supplied by that principle of sacramental efficacy as to which Augustine and his Pelagian opponents were at one,¹ although the latter did not fully apprehend its scope. It has been well said that “wherever there is a belief in the Church as the outward sign of Christ’s presence, and in the Christian ordinances as the channels of His grace, there we have facts in the world of religion which are to be recognised,

Dono Persev. 33. When he spoke of such persons as not having been truly made children of God, he meant, not according to His secret election : see below, p. 284.

¹ See *e.g.* c. Duas Ep. ii. 11. It would have been argumentatively convenient to Pelagians to deny that any spiritual blessing was actually conveyed to infants through baptism ; but, pressed by the weight of the general Christian tradition, they always maintained the affirmative, only denying that it involved a cleansing from inherited taint. Julian even represented Augustine’s view as disparaging to baptism, in that it supposed “concupiscence” to remain in the baptised. Cp. c. Duas Ep. i. 26.

whatever the effect may be upon our notions of God's secret will."¹ On this subject Augustine was never tempted to simplify his theory by neglecting a co-ordinate side of truth: he retained, he even emphasised, the traditional Catholic view of the Holy Spirit's working through the ordinances; and it is this which makes "predestinarianism" so different a thing in him from what it was in the great innovator of Geneva," whose version of Christianity has provoked such a recoil to unbelief.

It is time to make an end, although the theme is inexhaustibly suggestive. One might dwell, at least, on the closing scene, so solemn and pathetic, in which the old man of seventy-six, who had been thirty-five years

¹ Church Quart. Rev. xxiv. 283. Calvin, finding sacramentalism logically incompatible with his view of "the decrees," invented a new theory of sacraments, which reduced them from channels or means of grace to seals of a grace otherwise bestowed on the elect.

a bishop, lay dying of fever in that sad August of 430, when city after city had been taken by the Vandals, and only three remained, including his own Hippo,—and when he resolutely turned his thoughts from the prospect of fast-coming devastation to a transcript of penitential psalms, set up by his desire on the wall opposite his bed. In the humble spirit of penitence which, as he felt, must be the safest temper for even “highly esteemed Christians” at the end of their course,¹ Augustine, praying to the last with friends around him, was “taken away from the evil to come.” And surely his place is high among the saints; his passionate devotion to God and Christ, expressed in the lifelong eloquence of a career so fruitful in holy activities, is a fact beyond question which needs no enforcement. And what-

¹ He had been accustomed “in familiar conversation” to express this conviction; Possidius, c. 31.

ever deductions have to be made from his theological authority,—and some deductions of a grave kind are really inevitable,—we may say with a writer of the American Church, that “his work has abiding elements which belong to humanity; that he will continue to be needed, both negatively against . . . Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians, and positively for the great teachings of grace;”¹ in other words, for what characterises Christianity as the religion of man restored by the work of a Redeemer.

Once more, in conclusion, we may find in a Collect of the now disused Parisian rite for the 28th of August, a condensation of the lesson which a great life like this brings home to Christian hearts and consciences:

“ Almighty and merciful God, Who didst raise up the blessed Augustine in Thy

¹ Spalding, *The Teaching and Influence of St. Augustine*, p. 106. This small volume will be found very helpful to students.

Church as a witness and a defender of the Gospel of Thy grace, show forth in us, we beseech Thee, the power of that grace ; that we may be able both by Thy teaching to know Thy will, and by Thy working to perform it with ready hearts ; through Jesus Christ our Lord."

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX I.

THE view which Athanasius took of “the doctrine of the Father and the Son” may be illustrated from two of his smaller treatises, which are less well known than his Discourses or Orations against the Arians,—the “Exposition of Faith,” and the tract on the text, “All things have been delivered unto Me of My Father,” Matt. xi. 27.

In the former, he thus draws out the view of the Nicene Confession as to the Person of the Son of God.

“We believe . . . in one only-begotten Word, Wisdom, Son, begotten without a beginning, and eternally, of the Father; and this Word not (as) pronounced, not (as) conceived in the mind, not an efflux from the Perfect, not a section of the impassible nature, not an issue (from it); but a Son perfect in Himself, living and operative, the real Image of the Father, equal (to Him) in honour and equal in glory :” with a quotation of John v. 23.

In this passage Athanasius expressly denies that

our Lord, as the “Logos,” can be described as *προφορικός* or *ἀνδιάθετος*, a “Logos” in utterance or a “Logos” merely in thought. A writer of the second century, Theophilus of Antioch, had expressly so described Him (c. Autol. ii. 10, 22) in connection with the idea, entertained by certain Antenicene writers, of His having been from all eternity immanent in the Father, and having been begotten as Son when He was uttered as Word for the purpose of creating the world. “That these writers,” says Cardinal Newman, “held both the eternity and the hypostatic existence of the Word, I think beyond a doubt; . . . still, that they believed in His eternity viewed as the Son, I cannot persuade myself.”¹ But the eternity of the Sonship was held and taught by others, as the Alexandrian Fathers, with whose teaching Athanasius would be familiar: thus Origen says, in often-quoted words, “The Saviour is always being generated,” and in a passage cited by Athanasius in De Decr. Nic. 27, “The only-begotten Word ever coexisting with God”—i.e. the *gennesis* or Filiation is not an event, but an eternal fact in the Divine life; and the requirements of the Arian controversy would naturally discredit the notion of a non-eternal *gennesis*. And when Athanasius rejects one or

¹ Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical, p. 182.

both of the adjectives before us, as inapplicable to the Logos (cp. *Orat.* ii. 35), he means to disclaim, as adherents of the Nicene faith were so frequently called upon to disclaim, a Sabellianising denial of the Word's subsistence or actuality,—as if to say, He is not Word in any such sense as that of a word which we first think of and then pronounce.¹ So Cyril of Jerusalem says in his fourth Catechetical Lecture, that the Son is a Logos, “but not in the sense of a word pronounced and then diffused into the air, nor as resembling unsubstantial words.” Eusebius charges Marcellus with likening the Divine Word to a man's word as thought and as uttered, so as to deny His personality;² and this Marcello-Photinian notion is condemned by two Semi-arian confessions, the Macrostich and the long Sirmian, as given by Athanasius in his “*De Synodis*.” In like manner St. Ambrose says, “The Word (Verbum) is neither *prolativum*, nor what is called ἐρδιάθετον, but a Word which operates and lives” (*De Fide*, iv. 72).

Another term set aside by Athanasius is *ἀπόρροια*, effluence, which might suggest a materialistic

¹ See Athan. *Treatises*, *Lib. Fath.* i. 113 (in 2nd ed., ii. 341).

² *De Eccl. Theol.* ii. 15: “He imagines the Word that is in God to be *τοιουτόν τινα οἶον τὸν καθ' ἕμας*.”

idea. He again disclaims it in *Orat.* i. 21, though it has been used by Theognostus and Dionysius, whom he quotes, with *Wisdom* vii. 29 in their minds, as Athenagoras had applied it to the Holy Spirit. He also excludes *ἀπορρόη* in *De Decr.* Nic. 11. The like may be said of his rejection of *τμῆσις*, a section; such a phrase was, as he intimates, incompatible with the spirituality of the Divine nature, *Orat.* i. 21: compare *Orat.* iv. 2. And Eusebius, when explaining to his own diocese his acceptance of the Homoousion, observes that it does not involve any “severance” of the Son’s essence from the Father’s. So in *Orat.* i. 15, Athanasius deals with the Arian argument, that to call the Son (as he so often does) the “proper offspring of the Father’s essence,” carried with it the idea of *διαιρεσίς*,—and in the next chapter he similarly disowns the notion of *μερισμός*.

Once more, Athanasius rejects the term *προβολή*, projection, which the Valentinians (referred to by Arius in his letter to Alexander) had applied to the *Æon* “Jesus,” imagined to be the result of contributions from all the preceding *Æons*—which use of it Tertullian disclaims, while defending the term in an orthodox sense, as implying no separation of the Son from the Father (*Adv. Prax.* 8); Origen afterwards rejected it as sug-

gesting a materialistic notion (De Princip. iv. 28), and Athanasius here follows him. He thus distinguishes the Catholic conception from that which would reduce the Logos to an energy, and from that which would impair the immateriality of the Sonship: even as in his De Synodis, 45, he rescues the Homousion from the invidious materialistic sense put upon it by Paul of Samosata. He proceeds to call the Son *αὐτοτελής*, as in the second Discourse against Arians he repeatedly calls Him *αὐτοσοφία*, by way of emphasising His complete “subsistence:” with the same intention he describes him as “the veritable Image of the Father,” or, elsewhere, the ‘exact’ or fully adequate “Image.” He proceeds to guard the co-equality of the Son, as consistent with that derivative relation to the Father, implied in the idea of Sonship, which is often, but, as Cardinal Newman remarks, rather infelicitously, described as “subordination.”¹ This co-equality is again distinctly affirmed in De Synod. 49; in fact, it follows inevitably on the recognition of the Son as “God,” unless Christian thought is to assimilate the Pagan

¹ Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical, p. 128. Waterland, while “allowing a subordination of order, which is natural, and also in office, which is economical, constantly declares against inequality:” Works, ii. 456.

conception of gradations in deity, which, as has been pointed out above, was logically involved in Arianism.

After the words translated above, Athanasius claims *i* John v. 20, as warranting the phrase, “Very God,” applied to the Son in the Nicene Creed. He uses that text similarly in *Orat.* iii. 19. In the second chapter of the “Exposition” he repeats the disclaimer, as of all Sabellianising, so of all unspiritual notions about the Divine Sonship. The Son is not *νιοπάτωρ*, Son-Father; to call Him so is to deny Him to be really a Son, whereas He is “existent *from* the existent;” but neither may we think of the Trinity as of “three hypostases *divided from each other*, as in the case of men who are corporeally separate.”¹ The term *νιοπάτωρ* was taken by Arius to represent that Sabellianising conception which he habitually imputed to his Catholic opponents. Athanasius employs (as he does also in the *Discourses*) the illustration from a fountain and a stream, which are distinct yet inseparable, to indicate the relation between the Eternal Father and the Eternal Son. It is observable that in this tract he does not as yet adopt that contorted interpretation of *Col.* i. 16 which is suggested in his *Second Discourse*, and

¹ Cp. *Dionysius of Rome, ap. Decr. Nic.* 26.

which, as Bishop Lightfoot points out, gave unfortunate encouragement to the Marcellian misuse of the word Son, as having no reference to our Lord's pre-existent state; for he takes *πάσης κτίσεως*, not of the new creation as constituted in Christ, but in its ordinary and natural sense. He does, however, very needlessly, interpret Prov. viii. 22 as referring to the Incarnation; and he twice employs the phrase, "The Man of the Lord," for the visible humanity of Christ—a phrase which St. Augustine, on full consideration, wished he had never used, although he allowed that there was something to be said for it, and that he found it in "some Catholic expositors of Scripture" (Retract. i. 19). Obviously, he thought that it might encourage the notion which after his death was condemned as Nestorianism: but Athanasius used it in no such sense, and afterwards, in Orat. iv. 35, practically withdrew it.

The tract on *Omnia Mihi tradita sunt* anticipates the briefer reply given in Orat. iii. 36 to the Arian argument from that text. Athanasius here says in effect, "It does not refer to the creation of the world, as if the Son's lordship were a gift bestowed on Him in consequence of that creation; for lordship was involved in His own creative agency. Nor may we imagine that the Father then

abdicated His own government. The 'delivery' means the committal of mankind to Christ as Mediator, and the passage must be combined with another, 'All things that the Father hath are Mine,' which affirms at once the distinctness and the union of the Father and of the Son." The figure of the solar orb and the sunlight is employed in this tract, as in *De Synod.* 52, *Orat.* iii. 3; and so is that of a seal, "The Son is *σφραγίς ισότυπος*, in Himself exhibiting the Father,"—a phrase equivalent to "image" of the Father, and employed by St. Basil in *De Spir. Sancto*, 26. In the sixth chapter, Athanasius condescends to notice an absurd Arianising inference from the *Tersanctus* of the Seraphim, and insists that "the adorable Trinity is one and indivisible," and that the Unity admits of distinction, though not of separation, and excludes all confusion. "The thrice-repeated 'Holy' indicates the three perfect hypostases, while the" single "word 'Lord' exhibits the unity of essence." Here it is remarkable that Athanasius does not think himself precluded by that identification of "hypostasis" with "essence," in the Nicene anathema, which he himself as a general rule adopted,¹—nor by the fact that "three [separate] hypostases" had been asserted

¹ See, e.g. *ad Afros*, 4.

by Arius,—from employing the plural form, for the inseparable and “co-inherent” personalities, or subsistences, in the One Godhead. And the freedom which he thus allows himself would fit him for the task of mediating, at the Alexandrian Council of 362, between the two parties of Catholics who spoke of “one hypostasis,” meaning, the the indivisible essence, or real being, of God—and of “three hypostases,” as indicating the reality of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, respectively, in opposition to Sabellianism. The latter use, as is well known, prevailed, mainly through the influence of such writers as Basil and Gregory Nazianzen: and the Council of Chalcedon informed the Emperor Marcian that the phrase “three hypostases” was introduced in order to resist the Marcilian view. It should be added that Cardinal Newman considers the idea of personality to be contained in the early Christian use of “hypostasis” (as of “ousia”) in regard to God, as being, for all true Theists, a “real” or “living” God, not an abstract force or “anima mundi.” On this view, the transition from “one hypostasis” to “three hypostases” would be less marked than has usually been supposed.¹

In some of the later writings of Athanasius

¹ See *Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical*, p. 298.

(as in the Letters to Serapion, and Jovian, the “*Tomus ad Antiochenos*,” and the “*Ad Afros*”), the uncreatedness and essential divinity of the Holy Spirit are emphasised as against the theory called Macedonianism. He contends that while the Nicene fathers were not required by the discussions of their own time to enlarge upon the subject, they had virtually secured the truth by treating the Holy Spirit, equally with the Father and the Son, as an object of “belief.” The additions made in the “*Constantinopolitan*” recension of the Creed, describing the Spirit as “the Lord and Lifegiver,” etc., are substantially representative of the matured thought of Athanasius.

APPENDIX II.

“THIS, then,” says Athanasius, *Orat.* iii. 29, “is the characteristic drift of Holy Scripture, that the account of the Saviour which it contains is twofold, to the effect that He was always God, and is Son, being the Father’s Word and Effulgence and Wisdom, and that afterwards, for our sakes, He took flesh of Mary, the Mother of God¹ (*τῆς Θεο-*

¹ He uses this title for the Blessed Virgin three times in the third Discourse, to indicate that He who was humanly born of her was personally Divine.

τόκον), and became Man . . . and did not come into *a* man: and this it is necessary to understand, lest the impious men should fall into this error also, and deceive any persons into thinking that as in the ancient times ‘the Word came to’ each of the saints, so now also he sojourned in a man, hallowing him also, and manifested (in him) even as in the others. For if it had been so, and He had only appeared in a man, there would have been nothing marvellous in it, nor would beholders have thought it strange, saying . . . ‘Why dost Thou, being a man, make Thyself God?’ . . . Of old, then, He was wont to come to each of the saints, and to hallow those who received Him sincerely; but it was never said, when they were born, that *He* had become man, nor, when they suffered, that *He* Himself suffered. But when once at the close of the ages, He came among us from Mary, to put away sin, . . . then it is said that by assuming flesh *He* became man, and in flesh suffered for us, . . . and the Godhead dwelt bodily, as the Apostle says, in the flesh,—as much as to say, ‘Being (still) God, He (yet) had a body of His own, and, using it as an instrument, He became Man for our sakes.’ And on this account the properties of the flesh are said to be His, since they existed in Him, such as to hunger to

thirst, etc. . . . while He Himself did through His own body the works proper to the Word Himself, such as to raise the dead. . . . And the Word carried the infirmities of the flesh as His own, for the flesh was His own ; and the flesh ministered to the works of the Godhead, because they took place in it, for it was God's body. And well did the prophet say, 'He carried,' and not, 'He Himself healed, our infirmities ;' lest, if He were (considered as) external to the body, and as merely having cured it,—as He has always done, —He should leave men again under subjection to death. But He carrieth our infirmities, and He Himself beareth our sins, that it might be shown that He became Man for our sakes, and that the body which in Him bore our sins is His own body ; and He Himself was no way harmed while bearing up our sins in His body to the tree, while we men were redeemed from our own passions, and filled with the righteousness of the Word. Wherefore, while the flesh suffered, the Word was not external to it, for on this account the Passion also is said to be His : and while He was divinely doing the works of the Father, the flesh was not external to Him ; but rather the fact was that in the body itself did the Lord do these works. . . . In the case of Lazarus, He uttered a

human voice, as man ; but divinely, as God, He raised Lazarus from the dead. These things were so done and displayed, because it was not in semblance, but in truth, that he had a body ; and it became the Lord, in putting on human flesh, to put it on entire with its own susceptibilities, so that, as we say that the body was His own, so too we may say that the susceptibilities of the body were simply proper to Him, although they did not touch Him in His Godhead. If, then, the body had belonged to another, to that other would the susceptibilities have been attributed ; but if the flesh is the Word's . . . then must the susceptibilities of the flesh as necessarily be attributed to Him whose also the flesh is, . . . so that the grace may come from Him, and that we may not be worshippers of another, but in truth worshippers of God, because it is no created being, nor common man, but He that is by nature and in truth the Son from God, whom, though He has become man, we nevertheless invoke as Himself Lord and God and Saviour."

"The whole passage," says Cardinal Newman, "is as precise as if it had been written after the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies, though without the technical words then adopted." *E.g.* Athanasius does not speak of the "Hypostatic Union," nor of our Lord as existing "in two

natures;” but he indicates what those phrases represent when he repeats so emphatically that it was *αὐτός*, the Word Himself, or, as we should say, in His Divine Person, who appropriated the conditions of manhood without compromising the impassibility of Godhead, and adopted a human sphere of existence while continuing to occupy the Divine. He goes on in the next chapter (xxxiii.) to show, in effect, that had either the Manhood or the Godhead been absent, our Lord could not have been what He is to us, at once an appropriate and an adequate Redeemer. The context, with its “distinct and luminous protest by anticipation against Nestorianism,” may prevent any misconstruction of Athanasius’ use of “man” for our Lord’s manhood (Orat. iv. 7, 35), which, according to the sense of his teaching, as well as of Cyril’s after him, had no personality of its own, simply because it never existed except in union with,—as belonging to, because assumed by,—the one eternal Divine Self or Ego of Him who, being God, became flesh, or man, for our redemption; as Hooker says, “The personal being which the Son of God already had, suffered not the substance to be personal which He took; although, together with the nature which He had, the nature also which He took continueth; whereupon it followeth

against Nestorius, that no person was born of the Virgin but the Son of God," etc., E. P. v. 52. 3. And compare Pearson, On the Creed, Article IV., "For it was no other Person," etc. This use of *ἄνθρωπος* for our Lord's humanity as taken into union with His single Divine Person, apart from any Nestorian conception of Him as "*a* man," a human individual associated with the Son of God, is paralleled by a use of "homo" in St. Augustine, De Vera Religione, 32, and even in the "Tome" of St. Leo, and, centuries later, in St. Anselm, De Fide Trinitatis, 6. St. Thomas, however, disallows the statement that a Divine Person "assumpsit hominem," because "homo" properly signifies human nature in the concrete, as existing in a "*suppositum*" or "hypostasis," and the only "hypostasis" in Christ is Divine: Sum. iii. 4. 3. On Athanasius' care to exclude a Photinian view of Christ as a man in whom the Word, regarded as impersonal, dwelt with exceptional fulness, see Later Treatises of Athanasius, Lib. Fath. p. 10. The passage which we have been considering should be combined with his famous Letter to Epictetus, in which the view just referred to, and the Apollinarian denial of Christ's true humanity, are alike set aside.

APPENDIX III.

THE letter of Athanasius to Marcellinus on the interpretation of the Psalms exhibits him in the light of a spiritual adviser. Marcellinus had written to the archbishop, who asked the bearer of the letter, "Now that he is recovering from his illness, how does he spend his time?" The answer was, "In the study of Scripture, particularly of the Psalms: he takes great pains to ascertain the meaning of each." Athanasius, in his letter, tells Marcellinus that he himself has a special affection for that same book, as, indeed, he adds, for all the Scriptures; and he proceeds to draw on his recollection of the remarks made to him "long ago by an old man much given to sacred studies," who had held the Psalter in his hands while he spoke. The signal and characteristic charm of the Songs of Sion is described, in terms which remind us of the poem for St. Bartholomew's Day in the "Christian Year," as consisting in their power "of mirroring the movements of the reader's own mind," so that he learns more of himself, his own needs, his own duties, his own personal relations to God. While he is reading such parts of the Psalter as are "*not* prophetic of the Saviour," the words "find"

him as if exactly meant for him, and spoken straight to his own soul. He cannot help identifying himself with the Psalmist, and assimilating the contrition or the thankfulness to which the Psalm before him gives expression. The book is an exhaustive account, or “plan,” of human life in its entireness, in its complexity; it gives full instruction for times of persecution, or trial, or deliverances, or spiritual progress,—for crises which call to repentance or to thanksgiving. As if anticipating the words of Hooker, “Let there be any grief or disease incident to the soul of man, any wound or sickness, named, for which there is not in this treasure-house a present comfortable remedy at all times to be found,” Athanasius goes through a number of conditions, trials, moods of mind, and prescribes this or that Psalm as appropriate for this or that case; he mentions those which are most suitable for joyful occasions, which interpret the feelings of one whose prayer has been answered, which are most impressive as admonitions of duty.

Following our English enumeration of the Psalms, and passing by those suggestions which are most obvious, we find this teacher, so fully trained in the school of experience, recommending Pss. 11 and 100 as fitted to sustain faith in Providence, Ps. 19 as descriptive of the character

of a true citizen of the heavenly kingdom, Ps. 91 "as encouraging oneself and others in the true worship of God, and teaching how hope in Him does not bring to shame." He who had at times stood up *contra mundum* tells us that Ps. 31 will embolden those who are left alone while upholding the cause of truth. Another Psalm is mentioned in terms which seem to have a personal bearing: "When you are persecuted, and have retired into a desert place, do not be frightened, as if you were alone there, for you have God with you, and can resort to Him" in the words of Ps. 63. We can well imagine how, after the "flight" in 356, he would watch what Kingsley in "Hypatia" calls "the breathless blaze of the approaching day," amid the "utter stillness" of some remote monastic settlement, and take up the lofty strain of faith as it stands in the Septuagint, "O God, my God, to Thee I awake early." His profound sympathy with sufferers in a good cause, his earnest desire to help and inspirit them, find fervid utterance as the letter draws to a close. "If, with a sure trust in God, you repeat Psalms when under trial and persecution, you will come out as one more fully approved, and be conscious of the Lord's sheltering presence . . . If you have committed a sin, you will, by the help of psalmody, take shame to yourself, and

leave off sinning. If you have not, you will be glad that you are reaching forth to the things that are before ; when you are in struggles, you will thus gain strength, and will even convict those who are trying to mislead you. . . . If a man is anxious about those who are in suffering, let him recite Psalms, and he will then be all the more helpful to the sufferer, and will exhibit the reality and firmness of his own faith. . . . ‘Thy statutes,’ said the holy writer, ‘were my songs in the place of my sojourning.’”

But one of the most interesting passages in this letter is that in which the great champion of our Lord’s true Divinity insists on the comprehensiveness of His human example. “He not only taught, but did what He taught, so that each may hear Him speak, and, as if seeing Him in a portrait, may receive from Him the pattern for conduct while he hears, ‘Learn of Me.’ A more complete scheme of instruction in regard to virtue will nowhere be found than that which the Lord modelled in Himself. For whether it be forbearance, or philanthropy, or kindness, or courage, or compassion, or righteousness,—all these you will find displayed in Him, so that no help towards virtue will be lacking to one who contemplates *this* Human Life. . . . Wherefore, even before He

came to dwell among us, this (His character as an example) He sounded forth even in the Psalmists." In Bishop Alexander's words,¹ "This anticipation of the Christian character so long before Pentecost . . . is a continuous prophecy ever fulfilling itself in the Church. Every single Christian man who thus, as Athanasius wrote to Marcellinus, 'thoroughly perceives and learns the affections of his own soul in the Psalter,' finds in himself a separate witness of the Psalms to Christianity."

APPENDIX IV.

A REMARKABLE summary of the trials and endurances of Athanasius occurs in a letter of Pope Celestine I., "to the clergy and people of Constantinople," *i.e.* to those who were there opposing Nestorius, in August, 430.²

"All of you who have been expelled from the Church" (by the action of Nestorius) "have an almost contemporary example of conduct in Athanasius of blessed memory, the most wise bishop (*ἱερέως*) of the Alexandrian Church. Who is there that cannot take comfort from his endurance, that

¹ Bamp. Lect., p. 227.

² It is given in Mansi, Conc. iv. 1043.

cannot find an example in his steadfastness, that cannot derive hope from his longed-for return? He is expelled because Arius persecutes; but he must be recalled because the Lord is speeding him home. He suffered imprisonment, he suffered afflictions; and no wonder if this apostolical man experienced these sufferings by which the Apostle glories in having been himself exercised. In all these things he followed him who testifies that he 'takes pleasure in his afflictions.' He was driven away from Egypt, and he was refreshed in our country. Here his position was re-established; he found refreshment from fellowship at this see, from whence assistance always comes to Catholics. And yet, amid his afflictions, he felt no weariness when he had become a confessor in the persecution; wherefore no Christian ought to lament if a temporary exile is inflicted upon him, because no Christian is exiled from God."

One point in this description is rhetorical—Athanasius, apparently, never was imprisoned.

The moral and spiritual grandeur of his career has recently received a signally hearty tribute from a Nonconformist divine, the president of Cheshunt College. In a small volume on "Athanasius, his Life and Life-work," Dr. Reynolds repeatedly applies such a phrase as "lifelong martyrdom" to

his contention for “the unity of God, the real humanity, and the eternal essential divinity” of the Redeemer. “Athanasius was profoundly impressed in his earliest days with the transcendent significance of the Person of the Son of God incarnate. He saw every other truth in the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ, and all the history of man and revelation appeared to revolve around this sublime centre.” His admiration for monasticism is connected with his personal possession of “the secret of self-restraint,” and a “conspicuous self-oblation” is noted as the main feature of his character. He stands out as “the greatest man then living,” with a personality of “magnetic force,” “inflexible in purpose,” yet “a prince of mediators.” What is more, the Festal Letters show how earnestly “he was set upon the cultivation of the Divine life,” as the end towards which “orthodox doctrine was but a means;” and bring out “his piety toward God, his adoring gratitude to the Saviour from sin, the Victor of death, the Incarnate God,”—in a word, “a profound Christian consciousness, the image and memory of which the Church of Christ will not willingly let die.”

APPENDIX V.

FROM CHRYSOSTOM "DE SACERDOTIO," ON THE
IMPORTANCE OF THE PREACHER'S OFFICE.

IV. 2. . . . The Church of Christ, according to blessed Paul, is "Christ's Body;" and he who has been entrusted with it must train it into complete healthiness and extraordinary excellence, looking round on all sides lest there be anywhere spot, or wrinkle, or any other blemish of that kind, disfiguring that grace and beauty,—and, indeed, what is his duty but, according to man's capacity, to render it worthy of that immaculate and blessed Head which is set over it? For if those whose business it is to gain the healthy condition meet for athletes have need of physicians and trainers, and a diet rigidly prescribed, and continual exercise, and careful watching in many other forms,—for indeed a slight defect in them, if overlooked, upsets and destroys all,—how shall they whose lot it is to tend *this* body, which has to wrestle not with bodies but with the invisible powers, be able to keep it unharmed and healthy, unless they rise high above the standard of human virtue, and are familiar with every sort of treatment that is profitable for the soul?

3. Again, know you not that this body is both subject to more diseases and attacks than our flesh, and is more quickly injured, and more slowly regains health? And those who care for the fleshly bodies have discovered a variety of medicines, and a manifold apparatus of instruments, and diet suitable to the sick. And many a time a change into better air will of itself suffice to restore health to the invalid; and sometimes sleep coming on at the right moment relieves the physician of all trouble: whereas, in the case before us, all these things are out of the question; and, instead of them, next to good works, just one method and way of treatment has been given to us—teaching by the Word. This is our instrument, this our diet, this our excellent temperature of air; this is instead of medicine, instead of fire, instead of steel; if cutting and cautery are required, it is this which we must needs use;¹ and if this shall have lost its power, it is all over with the rest. With this we raise up a soul from its prostrate condition, and

¹ See De Laud. S. Pauli Apost. Hom. 5. “ You see a physician using now cautery, now lenitives, now the knife, now medicine. . . . If we approve of a physician for having recourse to these opposite methods, much more ought we to extol the soul of Paul when it thus applies itself to the cases of the sick. . . . For the sick in soul require not less variety of treatment than the sick in body.”

allay its inflammation, and cut away what is superfluous, and supply what is defective, and perform every other operation that contributes to the soul's health. For, with a view to ordering our life for the best, another life may excite us to an earnestness resembling its own ; but when the soul's sickness is caused by spurious doctrines, then is there great need of the Word, not only for the safety of our own household, but with regard to the contests from without. For, if one had the sword of the Spirit, and shield of faith, so far as to be able to work miracles, and by wonderful works to stop the mouths of the shameless, there might not then be a need of help from the Word ; yet rather not even then would its force be useless, but indeed highly necessary. For blessed Paul handled it, although he was everywhere admired for his miracles. And another member of that company exhorts us to give good heed to this power, saying, "Be ready to give an answer to every one who asketh you a reason about the hope that is in you."¹ And when on another occasion they united in committing to Stephen the task of providing for the needs of the widows, their one object was that they themselves might have leisure for "the ministry of the Word." I grant, however, that we

¹ 1 Pet. iii. 15.

should not be so intent on securing the Word, if we had the strength that comes from miracles. But since not a trace of that power is left remaining,¹ and on every side the foes are upon us, in great force and without intermission, it is simply indispensable to make use of this safeguard, that instead of being smitten with the darts of the enemy, we may, on the other hand, smite them.

4. Wherefore we must strive in good earnest, that “the Word of Christ may dwell in us richly.”² For it is not against a single kind of warfare that we have to prepare ourselves; this war of ours is complex, and results from a combination of diverse enemies. For they do not all use the same arms, nor are they practised in but one mode of attack. And he who is to undertake the conflict with all, must understand the arts of all; and in his single person must be archer and slinger, commander of a squadron and of a company, soldier and general, foot-soldier and horseman, fit for sea-fight and for siege. For in the case of military wars each man takes his part in repelling the enemy by doing the duty which he has individually undertaken. But

¹ So in 1 Cor. Hom. 6. 2. And in Col. Hom. 8. 5: “When the faith had to be planted, there were many persons” who could work miracles, etc.

² Col. iii. 16.

in the case before us, it is otherwise ; unless he who means to conquer is acquainted with all the forms of his art, the devil knows how to bring in his own robbers, and so to scatter the sheep at even one single point which may chance to be neglected. But this he cannot do when he perceives the shepherd to be familiar with all the required knowledge, and well acquainted with his tactics. Wherefore one must be well guarded at all points. For as long as a city is walled round on all sides, it is perfectly safe, and can mock at its besiegers : but if you can make a breach in the walls, only to the extent of a single postern, from that moment their whole circuit, however secure in every other part, is useless to it. So, then, it is with the City of God ; when it is walled round on all sides by the pastor's sagacity and intelligence as by a wall, all the devices of the enemy result in their shame, and make them a laughingstock, and the dwellers within abide unharmed. But when one is able to demolish even a part of it, although he does not destroy the whole, yet by means of that part the whole, so to say, is ruined. For what is the good of its contending successfully with Greeks, if it be ravaged by Jews ? or of its overcoming both these enemies, if it be preyed upon by Manicheans ? or if, after it has mastered these also, the sheep

stationed within are slaughtered by those who introduce fatalism?¹ And why must I recite the whole list of the devil's heresies, all of which the pastor must know well how to beat off, for otherwise, even by one of them the wolf can devour most of the sheep? And in the case of soldiers, it is from those who are in their ranks and are fighting that the victory or the defeat, as it may be, must always be expected; but here it is quite the contrary, for often the conflict with some enables others, who at first had not even gone into battle, nor exerted themselves at all, to win a victory while seated at their ease; and he whose experience in these matters was imperfect, is pierced with his own sword, and becomes a scorn to friends and foes alike. For instance—for I will endeavour to make my meaning clear to you by an example—those who have contracted the insanity of Valentinus and Marcion, and all whose minds are similarly diseased, erase from the catalogue of Divine Scriptures the Law given by God to Moses, while the Jews, on the other hand, value it to the extent of contending for its observance in every particular, even though the times prevent this, and when God's will is otherwise: whereas the Church

¹ See in 1 Cor. IIom. 22. 4: “Where are those who set up a fatalistic necessity against freedom of choice?” etc.

of God, avoiding the extremes on either side, walks in the middle path, and neither consents to submit to its yoke, nor endures to hear it disparaged ; but rather commends it, though it is now abolished, because it was once profitable for a season.¹ Therefore he who would fight against both parties must understand this due proportion. For if, in his desire to convince Jews that their adherence to the old legislation is unseasonable, he begins unsparingly to attack it, he gives a formidable handle to those heretics who are minded to make it contemptible ; and if, in his anxiety to silence the latter, he exalts the Law beyond measure, and magnifies it as if necessary at the present time, he opens the mouths of the Jews. Again, those who are possessed by the frenzy of Sabellius, and those who run wild with Arius, have equally fallen from the sound faith by rushing into extremes. And although both parties bear the name of Christian, yet if one examines their doctrines, he will find that, saving differences about terms, the

¹ See *Contra Judæos*, ii. 1. “Time was when the Law was beneficial and necessary ; now it has come to an end and is inoperative.” So *C. Anomœos*, x. 5, that the Law was well adapted to those who had to receive it, but when it had fulfilled its function in the education of human nature, it became *ἀτελέστερος*. Cp. *Aug. Ep. 82. 16*.

one party are in no better condition than Jews,—that the other have a great affinity to the heresy of Paul of Samosata,¹—and that both stand apart from the truth. Here then also the danger is great, and the path is narrow and contracted, and bounded by precipices on either side, and there is great reason to fear that, when you aim a blow at the one enemy, you may be stricken by the other. For if you say, “There is one Godhead,” Sabellius forthwith wrests the assertion in the interest of his own insensate theory; on the other hand, if you make distinctions, and say, “The Father is one, the Son is another, and the Holy Spirit is another,” down comes Arius, and perverts the difference between the Persons into the sense of a diversity of essence. We must therefore turn away from and avoid alike the impious confusion asserted by the former, and the insane division maintained by the latter; we must acknowledge the Godhead of

¹ Athanasius, in Decr. Nic. 1, Orat. iii. 27, and Gregory Nazianzen, in Apologet. 36, compare Arianism to Judaism: on the other hand, Basil says, “Sabellianism is a kind of Judaism,” because it denies the Trinity, Epist. 210. 3. Paul of Samosata was a Sabellian in regard to the Divine Logos or Wisdom. He had also, as Athanasius repeatedly says, a certain relation to Arianism; but whereas Arianism asserted the pre-existence of the Son, as the highest of creatures, he said that Jesus obtained the title of Son through His pre-eminent virtue.

Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit, to be One, but must also confess the Three “Hypostases,”¹ for thus shall we be able to fence off the attacks of both classes of adversaries. And many other conflicts also I could mention to you ; amidst which, unless you fight bravely and circumspectly, you will retreat with innumerable wounds. . . .

But indeed, with regard to the observance of precepts, a life can supply us with much aid,² for even in that respect I would not say that it alone can secure everything. 9. But when a contest is stirred up about doctrines, and all men are fighting from the ground of the same Scriptures, what force will the life be in this case able to exhibit ? What profit is there in many toils, when, after all those labours, a man falls into heresy in consequence of his great inexperience, and is cut off from the body of the Church,—which I know to have been the case with many ? What gain has he from his stout-heartedness ? None ; even as there is none from sound faith if the conduct be depraved. So, then, for these reasons it is necessary that one whose lot is to teach others should be of all men

¹ Compare *De Incomprehens. Dei Natura*, v. 2, where he speaks of “the first and unbegotten hypostasis” of the Father. Cp. in *Joan. Hom.* 49. 2. See p. 191.

² He had been speaking of St. Paul’s “apostolic life” as an example.

most experienced in such contests as we have referred to. For if he stands firm and secure himself, in no way injured by the gainsayers, yet the multitude of plain people who are under his guidance, when they see their leader defeated, and unable to say anything in reply to the opponents, lay the blame of his defeat, not on his infirmity, but on his doctrine as being unsound; and through the inexperience of one man the whole people are plunged into the depths of ruin.¹ For even if they do not altogether yield to the adversaries, yet still they are obliged to doubt about things which they were able to receive with confidence; and they are no longer able to lean with the same steadfastness on dogmas which they used to approach with inflexible faith; but so great a storm takes possession of their souls in consequence of the defeat of their teacher, that the mischief will end in shipwreck. How terrible is the perdition and the fire that are accumulated on the miserable head of that man for every one of these ruined souls, you will not need to learn from me, for you know it thoroughly for yourself. Is this, then, a mark of arrogance, is this a mark of vainglory, that I have no mind to be

¹ Cp. Isidore of Pelusium, Epist. ii. 235; “When they see their pastor getting the worst of it in discussions, they . . . ascribe his failure, not to his own inexperience, but to some unsoundness in his doctrine.”

the cause of the destruction of so many, nor to bring on myself a greater punishment than what is now reserved in the other world? Nay, who can say so? No one, save a person who is disposed to censure causelessly, and to play the philosopher in the case of calamities not his own.

V. 1. I have now given sufficient proof of the amount of experience which the teacher must have in order to maintain contests for the truth. But I have something else to mention as a cause of perils innumerable;—let me rather say that the cause is not this something else, but the incapacity of some persons for making a right use of it. For the thing itself indeed becomes helpful in procuring for us salvation and many blessings, when it finds those who administer it to be earnest and good men. What, then, is it? It is the great labour bestowed on *public discourses* addressed to the people.¹ For first, the great body of those who are under a man's rule do not choose to regard the speakers as in the position of teachers; but, transgressing the bounds of the rank of disciples, they claim that of the spectators who sit at the public theatrical contests. And as there the multitude is divided, and some attach themselves to this man and some to

¹ What follows is summarised in Bingham, b. vi. c. 3. s. 1.

that, so too here they take different sides as partisans of one man or of another, regarding what is spoken with feelings of partiality or of dislike. Nor is this the only grievance ; there is also another not less serious. For if it happens that one of the speakers has interwoven with his own discourse something from other men's works, he incurs more disgrace than those who steal money ; and often when he has taken nothing from any one, but is merely suspected of it, he is treated as if it were proved against him.¹ And why do I speak of other men's works ? He is not allowed to make any constant use even of what he has thought out for himself. For the majority have been accustomed to listen, not for their profit, but for their pleasure, even as those who sit to decide on tragedians or harpers.² And the power of eloquence thus becomes, in this case, more eagerly desired than ever by the sophists,³ when they are compelled to contend with each other. One needs here also a soul of high tone far surpassing one's own littleness, to correct the disorderly and unprofitable self-indulgence of the

¹ See St. Aug. de Doctr. Chr. iv. 62.

² Cp. in Act. Hom. 30. 3. So of old at Athens : *σοφιστῶν θεαταῖς ἐσικότες καθημένοις μᾶλλον ἢ περὶ πόλεως βουλευομένοις.* Thuc. iii. 38.

³ This term was now again used in an honourable sense, as when it was applied to Libanius.

multitude, and to be able to turn their attention to what is more profitable, so that the people may follow and yield to the teacher instead of being swayed by their cravings. And this can in no way be secured except by these two qualifications —contempt of praise,¹ and ability in speaking.

2. For if either be absent, that which remains becomes useless by its separation from the other. For if a man who despises praise does not supply teaching which is “with grace, and seasoned with salt,” he is soon despised by the mass of men, and gains nothing from his elevation of mind ; or, if he succeeds excellently in this point, but proves that the glory of applause is too much for him, then again the same mischievous result follows both to him and to the people, while he studies to say what will please rather than what will profit his hearers, on account of his eagerness for their praise.² And

¹ Cp. De Sacerd. iii. 9.

² Cp. his Homily, “Non esse ad gratiam concionandum,” Op. ii. 661. He quotes Acts xx. 27, and says that the preacher who speaks *πρόδης χάριν* ruins the soul. So Gregory Nazianzen describes preachers of “smooth things” as “corrupting the Word,” Apol. 46; and cp. Aug. de Doctr. Chr. iv. 8, “Semper vitanda est *perniciosa dulcedo*.” On the custom of applauding preachers, see Bingham, xiv. 4. 27. So Paul of Samosata was charged with hiring persons to applaud him : Euseb. vii. 30. Chrysostom often checks the practice, e.g. ad Pop. Ant. ii. 4, though he frankly owns that it gives

as one who has no feeling about popularity, but knows not how to speak, does not indeed give way to the people's pleasure, but, from his want of power to speak, is unable to be of any considerable use to them ; so, too, he who is carried along by the passion for encomiums, although he has the faculty for making the people better, supplies them, instead, with what is rather calculated to please them, while what he thus gains is but noisy applause.

3. On both sides, then, a really good ruler must be strong, lest one faculty be ruined by the other. For when he stands up in public, and says things which are likely to brace up careless persons to a stricter standard, and then stumbles and breaks down, and is constrained to blush by his want of words, forthwith the value of his discourse comes to nothing. For those whom he has rebuked, when annoyed by his exhortations, and not knowing how else to evade their force, have recourse to sarcastic flings at his "ignorance," thinking that thereby

him a momentary pleasure, in *Act. Hom. 30. 4.* (see below). See Augustine, *Serm. 61* : "These laudatory cries of yours make me tremble. They are leaves—I want fruit :" cp. *Serm. 126. 8.* Such acclamations greeted the sermons of Gregory Nazianzen, the discourse of Proclus on the *Theotocos*, the Christmas-day preaching of Paul of Emesa at Alexandria.

they can conceal their own disgrace. Therefore he ought, like some excellent charioteer, to attain perfection in both these good qualities, that he may be able to employ both in the fitting way. For when he puts himself out of the reach of everybody's censure, then he will be able with as much authoritativeness as he pleases both to rebuke and to spare all who are set under him; but until then this is no easy matter. And he ought to exhibit his high-mindedness not only to the extent of indifference to applauses, but to carry it further, that the advantage may not prove imperfect.

4. To what else, then, must he also be indifferent? To slander and to envy. It is well neither excessively to dread and tremble at, nor absolutely to pass by, unreasonable accusations (for indeed a prelate is obliged to endure groundless censures); but if they be false, then, although they be levelled at us by the vulgar, to endeavour speedily to extinguish them. For nothing swells the force of either a bad or good report like the disorderly multitude; for, being accustomed both to listen to things and to blurt them out without examining them, they heedlessly utter whatever comes uppermost, without any regard for truth. For this reason one must not despise the mass of men, but must cut down evil surmises as soon as

they arise, by persuading one's accusers [of their error], though they be the most irrational of mankind, and omit nothing at all that can do away with an unfavourable opinion. But if, do what we can, the censurers refuse to be persuaded, then treat them with contempt ; since, if a man is soon dejected by these mishaps, he will never be able to produce anything noble and admirable. For despondency and continual anxieties are sadly apt to overthrow the power of the soul, and reduce it to the extremest weakness. The priest, then, must be so disposed towards his people, as a father would be towards children that were mere infants ; and as, when they are petulant, or strike us, or cry, we do not take it to heart, neither do we ever make much of it if they smile and seemed pleased with us ; so, too, must he be neither elated by the approbation, nor dejected by the censures of his flock, when bestowed by them unseasonably. Now this is hard, my dear friend ; perhaps, methinks, it is even impossible. For to feel no joy when one is praised is what I know not if any man ever attained to ; and if one feels it, one naturally longs to enjoy such pleasure ; and if one longs to enjoy it, one must needs, in default of it, feel distressed and out of spirits. For as men who exult in being rich are discontented when they fall into poverty, and

those who are accustomed to luxury cannot endure a humble style of living ; so, too, those who have a passion for being panegyrised feel a wasting fanine of soul, not only when they are causelessly blamed, but even when they are not ceaselessly praised ; and that most especially when they have been nurtured on these things, or when they hear praise bestowed on others. Now, if a man brings this craving with him to the trial in which, as a teacher, he must be involved, how much trouble, how many griefs think you he must have ! The sea can no more be ever free from billows than his soul from anxieties and pain.

5. For if he has great abilities as a speaker (and this you will find in only a few) not even in that case is he set free from uninterrupted toils. For since eloquence is not natural, but acquired by study, a man will find that even if he attains it in the highest perfection, it will then leave him destitute, unless he cherishes this power with constant painstaking and exercise ; so that the labour required is greater for the wiser than for the more ignorant. For the extent of the penalty, in case of neglect, is not the same to both classes ; it is increased in proportion to the difference between their respective possessions. No one would blame the one class if they produced nothing worth

speaking of ; but unless the other class are ever putting forth something greater than the expectations which everybody forms about them, many an accusation from everybody is the result. Besides, the former will obtain great praise on the score of small performances ; but those of the latter, unless they are very admirable and astonishing, are not only deprived of encomiums, but received by many people with censure. For it is not so much the things said as the reputation of the speakers on which the audience sit in judgment : accordingly it is when a man, as a speaker, beats every one else, that for him, beyond all others, laborious painstaking is necessary ; for occasional failure, which is the common lot of human nature, is not permitted to him, but if his address does not in all respects square with the greatness of his reputation, he goes away loaded with a thousand scoffs and censures from the multitude. And nobody takes into consideration, with regard to him, the fact that an attack of despondency, and nervousness, and anxiety, and often, too, anger, will overcloud the clearness of the intellect, and not allow its productions to come forth in perfect purity ; and that, in a word, being but a man, he cannot be the same through everything and succeed in everything, but it is to be expected that sometimes he will make

mistakes, and appear to fall short of his native capacity. Of these points, as I said, they never choose to think, but accuse him as if they were judging an angel. Again, it is in human nature to overlook a neighbour's successful achievements, many and great though they be ; whereas if a shortcoming appears anywhere, though it be trivial, and have happened long ago, it is quickly observed, eagerly taken hold of, and perpetually remembered. And many a time such a little insignificant thing diminishes the reputation of many great men.

6. You see, my dear friend, that for one who has ability as a speaker, there is a special need of more elaborate painstaking, and, besides this, of so much forbearance as was not requisite for all those whom I formerly described to you at length. For many are continually attacking him without any reason or cause, and feel an animosity against him although they have no complaint to make except that he stands well with all. And he has to endure their bitter malice with a brave spirit. For while they cannot endure to conceal this execrable hatred which they causelessly conceive, they revile him, carp at him, slander him in private, and treat him villainously in public. Now, the soul that begins to feel pain and irritation under each of these trials, will ere long be worn out with its distress.

For people do not simply assail him in their own persons, but attempt to do it by means of others ; and often they pick out somebody who is no speaker at all, and praise him up to the skies, and express for him extravagant admiration ; some do this in ignorance, others partly in ignorance, partly in envy, not in order to exhibit as an object of admiration one who does not deserve it, but simply in order to destroy the other's reputation. Nor is it with these only that our high-souled man has to contend, but often with the inexperience of a whole people. For since all the congregation cannot be composed of men of culture, but the majority of the church is in fact made up of the uneducated, and the remainder, although indeed themselves more intelligent than the majority, yet are much more inferior to the real judges of eloquence than all the others are to themselves,—and there will be but one or two seated in the audience who possess this excellent quality,—it necessarily happens that the better speaker receives colder applauses, and sometimes retires without any token of approbation. And one has to prepare oneself bravely to meet this kind of unfairness ; to make allowance for those who entertain such feelings because they know no better ; to be sorry for those who are brought into this state of mind by an

envious temper, as for unhappy and pitiable persons ; and not to suppose that the opinion of either class can really detract from one's own ability. For if a first-rate painter, superior to all others in his art, were to see a figure which he had drawn with the utmost exactness sneered at by people who were unacquainted with that art, he ought not to be cast down, and think the picture a bad one because incompetent persons had so judged it ; even as he ought not to think a really bad picture admirable and charming, because unskilled persons looked open-mouthed at it.

7. For it is the accomplished workman himself that must be the judge of his own artistic works, and mark his productions as good or bad by no other criterion than the judgment of the mind which devised them ; but as for the opinion of the vulgar, which is all astray and uninformed about art, he should never once trouble his head about it. And so, too, let not him who has undertaken the trying duties of a teacher pay attention to the applauses of outsiders, nor be depressed in spirit for the want of them. But while his sermons are laboured at in such a way as to please God (for it is He, and not applauses nor praises, that should be the only standard and rule for judging the excellence of such work), if he is

also approved by men, let him not reject their encomiums; but if the audience do not bestow them, let him not seek for them, nor distress himself. For it is a sufficient consolation to him for his labours,—yes, the greatest consolation of all,—when his conscience can tell him that he has so arranged and harmonised his teaching as to please God.

8. For, if he is soon overcome by the appetite for irrational praises, he gains nothing by his many exertions, nor by his ability as a speaker. For if his soul cannot bear the foolish censures of the vulgar, he will give way utterly, and cease to take pains with his discourses. Wherefore this above all things is what we should be trained to—indifference to praise. For to preserve the power of speaking, it is not enough to know how to speak unless one has this quality besides. But if you were minded carefully to examine a man who is deficient in that excellence, you would find that he, too, not less than the other, needs to be able to despise praise. For he will be constrained to make many failures if he gives way to dependence on public opinion; for while he is too feeble to match himself with those who are approved for excellence in speaking, he will not refrain from plotting against them, envying them, blaming them

without cause, and in many such ways behaving himself unseemly ; on the contrary, he will dare anything, even to the perdition of his soul, for the sake of bringing down their reputation to the low level of his own insignificance. And, besides this, he will keep aloof from the exertions involved in work, because a kind of numbness will be diffused over his soul. For to toil hard, and win slight encomiums, is enough to bring down and plunge into a deep sleep one who cannot despise encomiums ; even as a husbandman, when he toils in a field where the soil is poor, and is forced to till rocky ground, soon gives up working unless he has a hearty good will about the matter, or unless the fear of hunger presses upon him. For if those who can speak with great freedom need so much exercise in order to preserve this faculty, suppose a man has collected no materials whatever, but is compelled to think over his subject at the very time of trial, then how much difficulty, how much disturbance, how much agitation will he have to go through in order that he may put a few words together ! But if of those who rank after him, and who are in a lower place than his own, any one should be able to outshine him in this point, he will then need a soul of superhuman tone in order not to be mastered by envy, nor prostrated

by despondency. For to be stationed in high dignity, and to be surpassed in success by one's inferiors, and to bear it generously, is the sign of no ordinary soul, nor of mine, but of a soul of adamant. If the person who surpasses one be considerate, and very modest, the annoyance becomes a thing which the man endures as best he may ; but if he be audacious, and a braggart, and vainglorious, the other must every day long for death, so bitter will he make life to him by open insults, by secret mockeries, by wresting many things from the sphere of his authority, by wishing to be everything himself. And in doing all this he is perfectly safe by possessing confidence as a speaker, and the attachment of the multitude to himself, and the affections of all the people. Do you not know how great a passion for oratory has broken in upon the souls of Christians at this time ? and that those who practise oratory are above all men had in honour, not only with the world, but also with the household of faith ? How, then, can any one endure such a disgrace as that when he is speaking all should be silent, and think themselves bored, and wait for the end of his discourse as if it were a refreshment from labours ; but that when another makes a long discourse they should listen with patience, and be vexed

when he is going to leave off, and provoked when he chooses to conclude? For if these things seem to you now to be slight matters and despicable, because of your inexperience, yet are they sufficient to extinguish zeal, and to paralyse the soul's vigour, unless one elevates himself above all human feelings, and studies to gain the temper of the incorporeal Powers, who are not beset by envy nor the love of glory, nor any other such disease. If, then, there be any such man as can trample under foot that wild beast, so hard to be caught, so invincible, so savage—*popular opinion*,—and cut off its many heads, or rather never suffer them at all to grow, he will be able easily to beat off these many attacks, and to enjoy a kind of tranquil harbour. But if he is not rid of it, he involves his own soul in a manifold warfare, and a perpetual agitation and despondency, and the throng of all other emotions. What need is there for me to recite the list of difficulties, which nobody will be able either to describe or to understand, unless he has been concerned in the business itself?

APPENDIX VI.

CHRYSOSTOM calls Anomœanism “a wild tree, which Paul did not plant, nor did Apollos water, nor did

God give it increase" (*De Incompr. Dei Natura*, Hom. 3. 1). The Anomœans, or ultra-Arians, whose theological watchword was the "Unlikeness" of the Son to the Father, and who desired thereby to avow their dissent—one might say, their scornful dissent—from all abatements of the Arian theory, and their resolution to carry it out to all lengths and in disregard of all consequences, had for their friends the singularly versatile and "irrepressible" Aetius, who, after passing through the occupations of an under-vinedresser, a goldsmith, a practitioner in medicine, and a "sophist," or hired exponent of medical theories, turned his attention to Arian theology in connection with Aristotelian logic, was ultimately ordained by an Arianising bishop of Antioch, and soon became the scandal of "moderate" Arians, and the leader of such as were "nothing if not thoroughgoing." His disciple Eunomius, "with more learning, was enabled," as Cardinal Newman words it, "to complete and fortify the Anomœan system, inheriting from his master the two peculiarities of character which belong to the school: the first, a faculty of subtle disputation and hard mathematical reasoning; the second, a fierce and, in one sense, an honest disdain of compromise," etc.¹ On one point,

¹ For Aetius and Eunomius, see Newman, *Arians*, p. 347

he differed from Arius himself, who had held that the Father's nature was shrouded in mystery even from the Son. Eunomius, on the contrary, as quoted by Socrates (iv. 7), had the audacity to write, "God knows no more about His own essence than we do; it is not more known to Him, and less to us, but whatever we may know of it, He also thoroughly knows, and, on the other hand, what He knows, that you will find to be exactly known among us." The language of Chrysostom, when opposing this absolute rejection of all mystery, is not that of mere vehement denunciation. He did indeed urge his hearers at Antioch to use "gentle and considerate" terms towards persons whose theory was a species of insanity (De Incompr. Hom. 2. 7), even as, alluding to Eunomius, he says, "A man has dared to say, 'I know God as God Himself knows Himself;' does this need confutation?" (De Incompr. 2. 3; comp. in Joan. Ev. Hom. 63. 3). But he argued elaborately from Scriptural assertions as to the incomprehensibleness of the Divine essence, yet always so as not to ignore the moral knowableness of the Divine character. St. Basil, some years

ff. Hefele says that the Anomoeans regarded God as in fact the "*όν*, not the *αὐτός*, . . . His absolute simplicity" being "equivalent to unbegottenness;" Councils, s. 77 (E. T. ii. 221).

earlier, had met the Anomœan question, “Do you worship a known or an unknown God?” by distinguishing the senses of the word “know.” “We know,” he said, “God’s majesty, power, wisdom, goodness, providence, and righteousness,—but not His essence itself.” Knowledge, he proceeded, is real yet partial, even as to human beings; we know them only up to a point. “I know any given individual, not as to his essence, but *κατὰ τὸν χαρακτῆρα καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἴδιωματα*, for in the same sense I both know and do not know myself.” So in regard to God, “if any one says that knowledge precedes faith, we do not dispute it; but the knowledge is such as is congruous to human capacity” (Ep. 234, 235). And St. Gregory Nazianzen, preaching at Constantinople, had laid it down that the nature of God was above the “comprehension” of even “lofty and devout minds,” so that in this world we could but perceive, so to speak, “a little ray from a vast light,” but that His existence, eternity, and spirituality could be inferred from nature; adding that men could not fully understand their own composite being (Orat. 28). And so Chrysostom notices the same question, “Do you know what you worship?” (in allusion to John iv. 22), and replies by the distinction, “We do not know what God is in His essence” (De Incompr. Dei Natura, 5. 5). After

quoting, “When I was a child,” and “Now we see through a glass darkly,” he says, “A child sees, hears, says many things, but nothing plainly; and thinks, but not at all distinctly. So, too, I know many things, but I do not understand the manner of them. I know that God is everywhere, and I know that He is wholly everywhere, but *how*, I know not: I know that He is without beginning, ingenerate, eternal, but *how*, I know not: for reason is incapable of knowing how it is possible for an essence to exist, yet to have its existence neither from itself nor from another. I know that He begat a Son, but *how*, I know not. I know that the Spirit is from Him, but *how* from Him, I understand not” (De Incompr. 1. 3). In another passage, after saying that God is inscrutable to the angels, and is known only by the Son and Holy Spirit, he shows in what sense He is using “known,” by insisting on the incapacity of human reasonings to define or embrace Him (De Incompr. 3. 1). The knowledge which he excludes is that which he calls “exact” (De Incompr. 4. 4), such a complete intellectual *scientia* as would render faith superfluous. Again, he observes that to “know” is not the same as to “comprehend” (De Incompr. 2. 6); and after remarking on the mysteriousness of the human soul’s nature,

and deprecating “curious inquiries” about God’s essence, goes on to speak of that effectual “access to God” which prayer opens, and which only a slothful diffidence declines to use (De Incompr. 5. 4, 5, 6). So it is that this great preacher of Divine mercy and human responsibility can point out the limitations of human thought, in regard to the interior being of the Highest, without giving occasion to agnosticism by ever appearing to forget that we can and do “know” our God as we know ourselves and our fellowmen. And if it were objected that Chrysostom, or other Fathers who taught like him, were thereby destroying the basis of theological “definitions,” the answer would be that as much of the language of Scripture itself, in its doctrinal revelations, is, in his phrase, a “condescension” to our capacity, so the most appropriate formulas which the Church or her theologians have devised as “words to take with us” in the study of our *credenda* have never been, and never can be, proposed or accepted as adequate. Alike on the Trinity and the Incarnation, not to say on the Atonement, “we may speak much, yet fall short;” the Homoousion, the Coinherence, the Hypostatic Union, are but helpful adumbrations of truths which transcend all speech. Some thoughts we must have of what God has

told us about Himself, and some words we must use in order to embody our thoughts: but while using them as true in their way and as good for their purpose, we must not forget that, as Augustine says in regard to the terms “person” and “substance,” “God is thought of more truly than He is spoken of, and He exists more truly than He is thought of” (*De Trin.* vii. 7).

St. Basil, in a passage which partly reminds us of our Trinity Sunday Proper Preface, insists that the character of incomprehensibleness, belonging to the Father, must be held also to belong to the Son and to the Holy Spirit (*Ep. 38. 3*).

APPENDIX VII.

THE preceding extracts from the “*De Sacerdotio*” will have exhibited some of the practical difficulties of a bishop in Chrysostom’s time. In the third book, he dwells at length on the subject. After explaining 1 Tim. iii. 1 by laying stress on the “desire of a good work,” as distinct from the desire of a position of authority for its own sake¹—

¹ Cp. in Eph. Hom. 11. 5, that bishops are “set in their office in order to teach, not to exercise arbitrary authority;” and in 2 Cor. Hom. 18. 3, “Great is the power of the

a form of ambition of which, he frankly admits, he has “a large share”—he expatiates on the trials which a bishop must be prepared to encounter, such as abusive language, sarcastic gibes, unreasonable censures.¹ He becomes a mark for captious criticism ; he has reason to apprehend hostility on the part of neighbouring prelates ; he cannot be sure of the loyalty of his own clergy. Many of his people will even look out for a vulnerable point in his character ; others will, at any rate, expect too much from one who, like themselves, is compassed with infirmity. The most varied pretexts will serve for a movement against him : “ He has come into

assembled Church. . . . Let us not throw everything upon the priests, but let us take a personal interest in the affairs of the whole Church as of a common body ; ” adding that the authority of Church rulers is *ἀρχὴ πνευματικὴ*—its main superiority consisting in their special burden of labour and anxiety for their people, etc.

¹ So, speaking at Constantinople from experience, he says, “If you did but know that a bishop is bound to belong to all, to bear the burdens of all : that others are pardoned for being angry, but he never ! . . . He is exposed to the tongues of all, to the criticism of all, both of wise and unwise ; he is harassed with anxieties every day, ay, every night. . . . Poor men, mere beggars, abuse him in the agora. . . . No one is afraid to accuse and slander him. . . . Why should I mention the anxiety about the word and doctrine, or the *difficulties attaching to ordinations ?* ” etc. In Act. Hom. 3. 4. Such language may correct idealistic notions about a “golden age” of ecclesiastical life and work.

collision with A, or B has been annoyed by his appointment ; he is young, or he is uncourtly, or he is too mild, or he is too rigorous." He must, in fact, unite modesty with dignity ; he must be gentle, yet must inspire due reverence ; he must be sociable, yet prove himself fit to rule. The details of administration will be a continuous test of his capacity. The Church's widows and the Church's virgins alike need careful oversight ; "poverty is a querulous thing, and a thankless." A bishop who has to deal with the poor must have an inexhaustible stock of steady patience, must never be grudging of his attention and his sympathy. Kind words must be freely expended on those whom suffering has made irritable. The revenues of the Church require its chief pastor to be a man of business ; the duty of hospitality to strangers, the duty of providing for the sick, make constant demands on "exactness and intelligence ;" tact is wanted to open the purses of the rich in the cause of charity ; sick people are "creatures hard to please." And "if a bishop does not daily go about the houses more regularly than the frequenter of the agora, this neglect gives offence indescribable ; for those who are in health, as well as the sick, expect to be visited," in most cases because they think it due to their position. In the daily

intercourse of life a bishop must be prepared for “touchiness ;” his tones, his looks, his very smiles are scrutinized by jealous self-importance ; he must be careful to give no handle to accusations. His office as an arbiter in disputes takes up a great deal of his time, involves a mass of vexatious and intricate business, and exposes him to the inconsiderate anger of those whom his awards may disappoint. When he acts as a spiritual judge, he must remember that discipline is a delicate instrument to handle ; if he is too stringent in censures he may do more harm than good to the soul of the offender, and so incur the Divine displeasure, and increase his own reckoning in the awful day of account (Heb. xiii. 17).

Again, in the sixth book, Chrysostom recurs to this thought of the pastor’s responsibility for souls : “If I have quoted that text before, I cannot now be silent about it ; for the terror of its menace is continually shaking my very soul.” Presently he goes on to speak of the thorns which choke the good seed in the hearts of Christian people, such as wealth, power, luxury, idleness, worldly anxiety, or, again, affliction, the pressure of poverty, the hardening effect of ill-treatment. “Not the smallest fraction of the multitude of sins can be known ” to the bishops, who, in fact, do not know the majority

of the sinners even by sight. Further on, he says that the “priest”—meaning here the bishop—must not only be holy as an habitual celebrant of the Holy Eucharist, “but also intelligent and of wide experience—as familiarly acquainted with all secular business as those who move in general society, and at the same time more free from ordinary ties than the monks. For, since he has to associate with men who are married, and bring up children, and keep servants, and live in the midst of great wealth, and are employed in public affairs, and occupy official posts, he must be versatile—I say versatile, not insincere,¹ not a flatterer and a hypocrite, but one who, while able to speak with perfect freedom and boldness, knows how to adapt himself with good effect when the occasion requires it, and must be at once kindly and austere. For he cannot deal with all his people in the same way, even as a physician would not apply the same treatment to all his patients, nor a pilot use but one method of contending with the winds. For the ship of the Church also is beset by continual storms, which not only assail it from without, but

¹ Cp. *De Laudibus S. Pauli Hom.* 5: “For he was a man versatile and many-sided,—not hypocritical, far from it! but one who ‘became all things’ which were involved in the requirements of his preaching and of the salvation of men.” Yet Chrysostom misunderstood Gal. ii. 11.

are produced from within; and there is great need to be at once accommodating and strict. But all these different things tend to one end—God's glory and the Church's edification."

APPENDIX VIII.

AUGUSTINE, in his first book against Julian of Eclanum, contends earnestly that the Pelagian has no right to claim "St. John of Constantinople" as on his side in regard to the Fall and its contaminating effects; that he fully acknowledged the doctrine of the Two Adams, and that therefore he could be no patron of the theory which reduced man's spiritual relation to the first or the Second, for evil or for good, to one of "imitation" merely. He quotes him as affirming that Adam by "that grievous sin condemned the whole human race" (Ep. 3. 3); and again, "It was not the sin which consisted in transgression of the law, but that of Adam's transgression, which contaminated everything" (in Rom. Hom. 10. 1); and again, in a sermon to neophytes, "It was Adam who brought in the beginning of the debt." He observes that in that sermon infants were said to "have no *sins*," meaning, no actual sin; and argues that Chrysostom's assertion, that

"in baptism persons die to sin," must be understood to include infants, and therefore involves the doctrine of "original sin." Accordingly he apostrophises the departed saint, "Enter, holy John, and take thy seat with thy brethren, from whom no reason and no trial has parted thee!"

But the passages quoted can hardly be said to come up to his own standard; they "do not amount to more than the doctrine of a universally inherited tendency to sin, and therefore liability to . . . death;"¹ and it would have been still more difficult to make out a substantial agreement between himself and Chrysostom on the kindred question of grace.

In the interest of moral action and responsibility, Chrysostom was habitually vigilant against language which seemed to minimise free will. Thus, in a sermon on Jer. x. 23 ("In illud, Domine, non est in homine"), he says that this text is bandied about everywhere, in houses, in market-places, in country, in towns, by land and sea, and on islands; go where you will, you will hear it quoted, and with it such a text as "It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth," etc. Why are they thus cited? As an excuse for men's own negligence. If such passages prove "that

¹ Stephens, *Life of Chrysostom*, p. 397.

nothing is in our own power," it is all over with the promise of "a kingdom, and with the menace of hell—with laws, punishments, chastisements, counsels." He then gives his own interpretation of the words of Jeremiah, to the effect that "it is of our own resolution to choose what is best, to will it, to be earnest about it, to labour hard for it ; but to bring our endeavours to good effect . . . is the work of the grace from above." Similarly in his first homily "In Verb. Ap. Habentes eumdem Spiritum," he says that "to believe at the beginning, to obey when we are called, is of our own right-mindedness ; but after the foundations of faith have been laid, then we need the aid of the Spirit, that our faith may remain perpetually unshaken. For neither God nor the grace of the Spirit anticipates (*προφθάνει = preevenit*) our choice ; He calls us, indeed, but He waits for us to come to Him voluntarily, and then, when we have come to Him. He affords us all the support that is His to give." Again, in the eighteenth homily on St. John, c. 3 : "God does not anticipate our volitions by His gifts ; but when we have begun, then He Himself gives us, in abundance, the means of salvation." And in two homilies (twenty-fifth and fifty-eighth) on Genesis : "He waits for us to make the start, that He may display His liberality in full measure ;

let us not, then, through indolence deprive ourselves of His gifts, but hasten to make a good beginning, in order that we may enjoy the assistance that comes from above, and may be able to attain the end ;” and, “ Although Jacob enjoyed the heavenly assistance, yet still he first exhibited what he could do on his own part. So let us be assured, that although we may make a thousand efforts, we shall never be able to achieve anything unless we receive the impulse from above. As we are unable to achieve what is right unless we receive that assistance, so, unless we contribute our own efforts, we shall never be able to receive the impulse from above.” So in Phil. Hom. 1. 3, he speaks of Christians as “ attracting grace to co-operate with them.” True, in Expos. in Ps. 115, c. 2, he explains the previous self-preparation as receptiveness or “ docility of soul ;” but the language quoted above is, in itself, an anticipation of Semi-Pelagianism ; and Montfaucon’s attempt to find room for initiatory grace under the word “ never ” will hardly be thought successful. Tillemont, with a touching simplicity, suggests that “ if St. Chrysostom could have had one or two conferences with St. Augustine, there is every reason to believe that he would have become un défenseur aussi parfait qu’intrépide

de la véritable grace de Jésus-Christ" (xi. 357). However this may be, it is obvious that, in Tillemont's words, Chrysostom had "considered man" rather in his original than in his fallen estate: "he had not had to contend with the Pelagian enemies of grace, but with Manichean and other heretics who were enemies of nature and of free will." Montfaucon similarly, and fairly, refers to the fact that he preached before the Pelagian controversy had rendered exactness of language on this point indispensable; and it would therefore be inequitable to class him with the Semi-Pelagians who formulated their denial of preventient grace nearly twenty years after that controversy had begun. Still, when all is said, this is *the* weak point in Chrysostom's teaching.

APPENDIX IX.

WITHOUT entering fully on the Origenistic controversy of Chrysostom's time, it may be well to observe that certain extant letters of Theophilus (with which should be compared such passages of Jerome's writings as c. Ruf. i. 6, ii. 12, iii. 5, Epist. 124) indicate plainly enough the chief errors then imputed to Origen, and constructively to

those who were called Origenists. The letters in question were the “*Paschal letters*” for the years 401 and 402, and a synodical letter assigned by Vallarsi to the early autumn of 401,—these being, in Vallarsi’s enumeration, the 96th, 98th, and 92nd of the Hieronymian series.

Theophilus (amid much fluency of invective) refers to some minor points, but lays chief stress on the following charges of heterodoxy. 1. Origen, he affirms, maintained that the Son was “*reality*” in comparison with us, but “*unreality*” in comparison with the Father; that as Paul and Peter were inferior to Him, so was He to the Father; that prayer ought not to be made to Him, nor to the Father with Him; that it was His soul which pre-existed in the form of God, and to which the “*self-emptying*” was attributed; that the Word and the Holy Spirit had no office towards the irrational creation. 2. That He would again become incarnate, and suffer, for the benefit of the evil spirits; that after many revolutions of ages, His (Divine) kingdom would come to an end, and the devil, restored to holiness and glory, would be associated with him in “*subjection*” to the Father. 3. That God could not have created more spiritual beings or “*souls*” than were in existence, for He created just as many as He could govern; that He was

constrained to form bodies for the imprisonment of "souls" that had lapsed from holiness, so that the whole organisation of the visible universe was a result of their antecedent sin; that the angels had been raised to their rank as heavenly powers, in order to fill up the places thus forfeited; then there would be a continual alternation of upward and downward movements of souls; and (4) that even after the resurrection the bodies of the saints would be perishable, and ultimately be "resolved into thin air."

No one would expect controversial fairness from the persecutor of Chrysostom, who, when an immediate purpose had been served, could calmly declare that *he* knew how to gather the flowers, as well as to avoid the thorns, in Origen's books. It was certainly gross unfairness on his part to ignore the distinct assertion, in *De Princip.* i. 2, of our Lord's co-eternal Divinity, and indeed of His co-equality, although, on this latter point, Origen's language elsewhere is at least unsatisfactory—as are his admissions of the lawfulness of prayer, in a certain sense, to the Son; and Dr. Bigg's representation of his view, that "in the supreme moment of adoration, when the soul strains upwards to lay itself as a sacrifice before the highest object of thought, we must not stop short of Him

who is above all," *i.e.* the Father (Bamp. Lect. p. 186), would still leave him at variance with himself, if he held that "the Son is verily and substantially God, and therefore of necessity co- eternal and co-equal with the Father" (ib. p. 167). The able and scholarly work just quoted may be consulted with advantage on the complicated question of Origenism; but it will probably leave, or confirm, the impression that after all due abatements on the score of his tentative language, his inconsistencies of statement, the unsystematic character of his mind, and his genuine desire to think with the Church, there was in Origen's speculations a gravely unsound element, which carried idealism to a perilous excess, and on which no "ecclesia docens" could set its seal.

Palladius, the biographer and loyal adherent of Chrysostom, has told the story of the Nitrian monks and of the tyranny of Theophilus.¹ He shows us the all-powerful archbishop ordering them to be expelled from their home without any cause assigned; when they came to remonstrate, he glares at them furiously, writhes his lips into a bitter smile, throws his scarf round the neck of

¹ See Palladius, pp. 54-57. He adds that there was no pretext for the fact that they had interceded with Theophilus on behalf of Isidore.

one of the Tall Brothers, strikes him on the face, and exclaims, “You heretic, anathematise Origen !” We see him invading their settlement by night, causing Ethiopian attendants to treat one of them, whom he had made a bishop, with rude violence, and setting fire to the cells and all that they contained, including copies of Scripture, the reserved Sacrament, and, “as eye-witnesses asserted, a young child also.” On the other hand, Theophilus himself, in his synodical letter and in his Paschal letter for 402, gives his own version of the story. There we read of a synodical censure of Origen’s “*De Principiis*,” a formal condemnation of Origenists, a regular visitation of Nitria resisted by Origenist monks with the aid of “hired slaves and freedmen,” and with “clubs concealed under palm-branches,” and of a subsequent tumult in Alexandria, calculated to excite the Pagans against the patriarch who had destroyed the “*Sera-peum*.” He complains of those who “once boasted of being lovers of solitude,” but were now “carping at ecclesiastical discipline;” and poses as their “father who has done them no hurt, and is only anxious to receive them again into his indulgent bosom.” While we cannot trust Theophilus in his own vindication, we need not take every detail in the sensational narrative of one who detested

him as if it were pure historical fact. This, at least, appears indisputable — that Theophilus thought fit, from motives of policy, to rehabilitate himself with the majority of Egyptian monks, whose superstitious literalism he despised, by heading an anti-Origenistic movement ; that the Nitrian monks were really obnoxious to him, as friends of his *quondam* friend Isidore, against whom he had, for personal and discreditable reasons, conceived a strong animosity ; that he chose to brand them as Origenists, caused them to be excommunicated by a synod, and ejected them from their settlement, replacing them (as he told Jerome) with monks amenable to discipline and free from all inclinations to heresy. This happened, apparently, in the summer of 401.

“Who can speak with patience,” asks Cardinal Newman, “of *that* Theophilus?” (Apologia, p. 399, ed. 1). That there were some good points in his administration must be acknowledged ; but, on the whole, he stands out as a conspicuous instance of the demoralising effect, on zealous and energetic ecclesiastics, of power too great for any but saintly hands. Compare Newman’s Historical Sketches, iii. 339.

APPENDIX X.

Two of the charges brought against Chrysostom had reference to his administration of Sacraments. “He has performed baptism after eating, and given Communion to persons after they had eaten.” He repels both charges with startling vehemence. “If I did so, anathema to me! let me not be reckoned among bishops,” etc. “If I did so, let my name be blotted out of the register of bishops! . . . yea, Christ shall cast me out of His kingdom.” Here, in the passionate Oriental style, he denies, with imprecations, the truth of the facts alleged. But he at once proceeds to argue that, supposing they had been true, they would have involved no sin beyond the breach of a Church rule which he held to be binding on his conscience. “If my accusers press the point,” he says, “let them pass sentence on Paul, because after he had supped he gave baptism to the gaoler; nay, on Christ Himself, because it was after supper that He gave Communion to the disciples” (*Serm. antequam iret in exsiliū, 4: Ep. 125*). Three points are worthy of attention; (1) the obligation of being in a fasting condition when communicating is combined with a similar obligation in reference to

baptism, and the grounds of both are taken to be ecclesiastical ; (2) the “baptising” here in question is clearly the solemn administration of the initiatory sacrament on the great fast of Easter Eve ; (3) the ordinary hour for the Sunday Eucharist was about 9 a.m. Formerly, in 1 Cor. Hom. 27. 5, Chrysostom had spoken less absolutely, showing that self-control as to food was still more appropriate after communicating than before, but adding, “You will ask, ‘Ought we to fast after receiving?’ I do not say that,—it would be an excellent thing to do so, but I do not enforce it ; I only exhort you not to feast to excess.” Augustine goes further than Chrysostom in Ep. 54, where he traces the rule of fasting communion to St. Paul, and so ultimately to the Holy Spirit.

APPENDIX XI.

“*Soliloquium*,” says Archbishop Trench, “seems to us so natural, indeed so necessary a word,—this ‘soliloquy,’ or talking of a man with himself, something which would so inevitably seek out its suitable expression,—that it is hard to persuade oneself that no one spoke of a ‘soliloquy’ before Augustine, that the word should have been invented,

as he distinctly informs us, by himself" (Study of Words, p. 127). Augustine calls the word "new, and perhaps harsh, but sufficiently well adapted for representing the thing meant" (Solil. ii. 14). The work, which in his "Retractationes" he describes as unfinished, was written in the year of his baptism. Its first chapter contains a series of earnest prayers for help to the knowledge of what was good and what was evil. A few specimens may be interesting.

"O God, the Framer of the universe, grant, in the first place, that I may ask of Thee aright; then that I may bear myself so as to be worthy of being heard by Thee; lastly, that Thou wouldest deliver me. . . . O God, Father of truth, Father of wisdom, Father of the true and highest life, Father of blessedness, Father of what is good and beautiful, Father of intellectual light, Father of our awakening and illumination, Father of the pledge whereby we are admonished to return to Thee; Thee I invoke, O God of truth, in whom and from whom all things are true that are true, . . . in whom and from whom and through whom all things live that do really and in the highest sense live. . . . O God, from whom to turn away is to fall, to whom to be converted is to rise again, in whom to abide is to stand; O God, from whom

to go away is to die, to whom to return is to revive, in whom to dwell is to live; O God, whom no one loses unless he be deceived, whom no one seeks unless admonished, whom no one finds unless cleansed. . . . O God, to whom faith stirs us up, hope uplifts us, charity joins us. . . . O God, who recallest us into the way; O God, who bringest us up to the door; O God, who causest it to be opened to those that knock. . . . O God, who cleansest us, and preparest us for Divine rewards, do Thou come propitiously to me! . . . Thou, One God, do Thou come to my aid; one eternal true substance, wherein is no diversity, no confusion, no passing away, no deficiency, no death; wherein is perfect concord, perfect clearness, perfect steadfastness, perfect fulness, perfect life, . . . hear, hear, hear me, my God, my Lord, my King, my Father, my Cause, my Hope, my Possession, my Honour, my Home, my Country, my Salvation, my Light, my Life; hear, hear, hear me, in that way of Thine, best known to a few. Thee alone do I now love, Thee alone do I follow, Thee alone do I seek, Thee alone am I prepared to serve, because Thou alone hast rightful sovereignty; I desire to be under Thy sway. Bid, I pray Thee, and command whatever Thou wilt, but heal and open mine ears, to hear Thy voice, . . .

mine eyes, to see Thy nod. . . . Receive, I pray Thee, Thy runaway, O Lord, most merciful Father; let me now at last have long enough endured penalties, long enough been the slave of Thy foes whom Thou hast under Thy feet, long enough been the sport of deceits. . . . I feel that I ought to return to Thee; let Thy door be open to me that knock; teach me how I may reach Thee. Nothing else but my will have I; nothing else do I know than that things unstable and transient must be despised, and things certain and eternal must be sought for. This I do, O Father, because this alone I know: but how to reach Thee, I know not. Do Thou instruct me, do Thou show me the way, do Thou supply me with provision for the journey. If it is by faith that they who flee to Thee find Thee, give me faith; if by virtue, virtue; if by knowledge, knowledge. Increase in me faith, increase hope, increase charity. How marvellous, how matchless is Thy goodness! . . . Thou art the supreme Good, which no one has rightly sought for and utterly failed to find, and every one has sought rightly, whom Thou madest to seek rightly. Make me to seek Thee, O Father; reclaim me from my wandering; while I am seeking Thee, let nothing else come in my way instead of Thee. If I desire nothing else but Thee, let me now find

Thee, I pray, O Father. But if there is in me a craving for anything superfluous, do Thou Thyself cleanse me, and make me fit to see Thee. But as to the health of this mortal body of mine, so long as I know not what, on its part, is profitable for myself or for those whom I love, that matter I entrust to Thee, O Father all-wise and all-good, and in regard to that will make such requests as Thou shalt for the time suggest to me. Only I pray of Thine infinite mercy that Thou wilt thoroughly convert me to Thyself, wilt cause nothing to oppose me while I am on my way to Thee, and wilt command that, while I bear about this body of mine, I may be pure, highminded, just, prudent, may perfectly love and perceive Thy wisdom, may be worthy to inhabit, and may come to inhabit, Thy most blessed kingdom. Amen, Amen."

APPENDIX XII.

AUGUSTINE frequently refers to Paganism as still a living force in African social life. In Epistle 47, he replies to certain questions proposed to him by Publicola on such points of conscience as the following: Is a Christian compromised by accepting an oath sworn by barbarians under the invoca-

tion of their gods? May a Christian knowingly cut wood from a grove which has been used for Pagan worship? May he drink from a well into which part of a Pagan sacrifice has been poured? May he use as food or drink what comes from a threshingfloor, or a winepress, from which an offering to idols has been taken? May he, in extremity of hunger, and in default of all other food, taste what he finds in an idol-precinct, no idolater being present? Augustine refers the querist to St. Paul's instructions, and deprecates a minute scrupulosity which would involve the renunciation of all benefit from light and air, because they had been idolatrously deified. Again, we find Volusianus, a man of high position and a serious "inquirer," propounding, partly in his own name and partly through the tribune Marcellinus, certain "difficulties" as to Christianity: Was not the doctrine of the Incarnation, and of the earthly life of the Incarnate, humiliating to the Divine dignity? Could the old Judaic observances have ever been right, if Christians were right in treating them as abrogated? How could the Christian precept of non-resistance to evil be reconciled with the good order of civil society? Augustine, in reply, points out that the Incarnation did not involve any suspension of that providential government

which God, being Spirit, universally exercises ; and asks what works the objector would think worthy of God, on the supposition of His becoming incarnate ? He then draws out, with magnificent fulness, the “ evidences ” from the early history of the chosen people,—from Old Testament symbolism and prophecy,—from the results of Christ’s ministry in the wonderful power of the apostles’ preaching and the patience and steadfastness of the Church,—from the involuntary testimony of the Jews,—from the predicted decay of idolatry and upgrowth of heresies,—from the supreme excellence of Christian moral teachings,—from the adaptation of Scripture to the most various capacities and needs. In regard to the abrogation of Jewish rites, he urges that it implied no mutability in the Divine purpose, because the same principle of action may, at different times, require different applications, and the same remedy will not suit all conditions of the same disease. If it is objected that the Gospel ethics are too exalted to be practicable, it is to be observed that forgivingness tends directly to social concord ; that the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount are to be fulfilled in a deeper sense than the merely literal ; that Christianity does not condemn war as such ; in fact, that Christian morality, largely and fairly interpreted, is not prejudicial, but

beneficial to the commonwealth, which, as he significantly remarks, is *not* really in a happy condition when money is squandered and “works of mercy are derided, when actors are pampered and poor men can scarcely get bread, when theatres ring with the cry, ‘Give us back the gods’” whose worship was the source of man’s degradation. If Christian emperors have ever been unfortunate as rulers, that was not the fault of their creed, but of themselves or of their ministers; and what could be worse than the moral horrors of Roman society before Christ’s Advent? What would have become of it, but for the practical effects of the Cross, as invested with “so high and steadfast an authority?” (Epp. 137, 138, written A.D. 412.) In Sermon 47 he notices another Pagan objection, taken up when nothing else remained to be urged,—the too familiar and effective taunt, “Let Christians first agree among themselves.”

In the seventh “tract” on St. John’s Gospel, s. 6, Augustine refers to the habit of “mixing up Christ’s name with magical spells,” and with the cultus of a deity represented as wearing the felt cap of enfranchised slaves. This sort of “unequal” combination was akin to those which in after ages severely exercised the patience of missionaries to the northern races of Europe. Augustine had

to say plainly, "Do not let us, when we have a headache, run to enchanters. . . . Every day I find this going on; what am I to do? Have I still to persuade Christians to make Christ their ground of hope? How many have died after employing those charms? how many have lived without employing them?" In Sermon 62 he repeats, as a text literally apposite to existing circumstances, the words, "If any one sees thee who hast knowledge sitting at meat in an idol's temple." The Christian who allows himself in such freedoms is supposed to say, "'God knows my heart.' Yes, but your brother does not." Or, "I am afraid of offending my superior" by noncompliance. Who is your superior? In the highest sense, "God. We desire to gather in the remaining Pagans: you are stones in the path; they are willing to come, but stumble, and turn back, for they say in their hearts, 'Why should we abandon the gods whom Christians themselves worship along with us?'" Or a person says in excuse, "It is not a god that is worshipped; it is the genius of Carthage." As if, supposing it were Mars or Mercury, it would be a god! What you have to consider is, not what it is, but what they take it for:" that they do take that image for a deity, "the altar testifies," etc. In *De Civ. Dei*, i. 35, he says that there are

professing Christians who join Pagans in filling the theatres on one day, and on the next day “join us in filling the churches.” In Sermons 196, 198, he complains of some Christians who joined in Pagan observances on January 1st and June 24th.

Another interesting passage is *De Genesi ad Litteram*, i. 39. It warns Christians against compromising Christianity by an exposure of their own ignorance in conversation with unbelievers. “It is too disgraceful and pernicious . . . that any unbeliever should hear a Christian talk mere nonsense as if on Scriptural authority” on subjects of physical science, “and, perceiving him to be, as the saying is, *toto cælo* wrong, should scarce be able to restrain his laughter. The mischief is not so much that a man is laughed at when he is in error, as that persons outside our pale should believe our authorities to have held such notions, and on that ground should set them aside as ignorant. . . . For if they find any Christian making mistakes on matters with which they themselves are thoroughly familiar, and adducing Scripture in support of his groundless opinion, how can we expect them to trust Scripture on the subject of the resurrection of the dead, and the hope of eternal life, and the kingdom of heaven, when they have come to think it erroneous on

subjects which they have been in a position to study, and on which they have formed conclusions admitting of no doubt? There are no words to express the annoyance and vexation caused to thoughtful brethren by rash presumption of this sort."

APPENDIX XIII.

THE idea of the great apologetic work "On the City of God" seems to be adumbrated in one of Augustine's letters, already mentioned, on the difficulties proposed by Volusianus. He there speaks (Ep. 138. 17) of a "heavenly and divine commonwealth, into which we are admitted as citizens by means of faith, hope, and charity; whose king is truth, whose law is charity, whose mode of existence is eternity." But the "Retractationes" tell us what led him to begin the treatise. The Pagans attributed the great disaster of the taking of Rome, in 410, to Christianity, and became "more bitter and vehement than ever in their blasphemies against the true God." "The evils which" Rome "had endured they imputed to Christ" (Civ. Dei, i. 1). It was another form of the once popular Pagan saying, "Lack of rain, Christians the cause" (Civ. Dei, ii. 3),—a survival of that old preconception which ascribed famine or

pestilence, or a flood of the Tiber, or a failure of the Nile's inundation, to the wrath of the gods at the toleration of a sect which disowned them (Tertull. *Apol.* 40). It was then that, "in zeal for God's house," Augustine "undertook to combat their blasphemies, or errors, by writing on the City of God." He published the first three books before the death of Marcellinus; and Macedonius, "Vicar" of Africa, expressed in lively terms the pleasure with which he had read them. "They were not so dull and uninteresting as to let me think about anything else. They laid hands on me, carried me away from other subjects of thought, and bound me in their chains; so that I am in doubt what most to admire in them, the perfect expression of a true priest's mind, the knowledge of philosophical theories and of history, or the delightful eloquence which can so charm even uninformed readers that they cannot leave off until they have finished the books, and, when they have finished, must turn to them again" (*Ep.* 154). He adds that Augustine has proved, against persons "shamelessly pertinacious" in their hostility to Christianity, that even in the ages which they call happy, worse events happened from causes which nature keeps secret,—while "our Christian precepts, and the mysteries of the true and only

God, not only promise eternal life to the purest virtues, but even alleviate the temporal misfortunes which as men we are born to endure.” The first five books, Augustine himself explains, “were written against those who thought that the gods were to be worshipped for the sake of the good things of this life; the next five against those who held that the worship of the gods should be maintained for the sake of a life to come after death.” The remaining twelve books were intended to meet the criticism, that the argument had been destructive, not constructive; Augustine set himself in them to describe the origin, the development, and the appointed ends, of the two “cities” or “societies of men” opposed to each other—the one “based on love of self issuing in contempt of God, the other on love of God issuing in contempt of self” (xiv. 28). He afterwards explains that the earthly “city” is not purely and merely evil: it can secure some kinds of good, “sine dubio Dei dona,” but they are not the highest; it began with unbrotherly self-assertion, consummated in fratricide; its spirit had found complete expression in that Roman republic which had been ruined by its own corruptions before Christ came to make all things new.

There had been preparations for the idea of a

City of God. The Empire had welded the nations into a comprehensive secular unity; the great Stoics had had visions of a universal human brotherhood. The Catholic Church had now been for many eventful years "in evidence;" it had presented to men's view not a mere idea of sanctified human order, but a "visible polity, an institution, with a definite organisation, with a constitution and a code of laws," and ranks of "officers" and conditions of citizenship.¹ And so, in the words of Dean Merivale, "The hour had come, and the man was not wanting. . . . The manifestation of the City of God by Augustine, the explanation of God's divine appointments from the creation to the redemption of man, was a full and final appeal to the conscience of the inquiring heathens, the stricken and despairing votaries of the discredited city of the Romans."² The visible kingdom of Christ was to lead to, and to be absorbed into, the Holy Jerusalem of the Apocalypse; and Augustine, when, within four years of his own departure, he wrote the concluding or twenty-second book, burst forth into a rapture of expectation which might seem to anticipate the mediæval hymn familiar to us as beginning, "O what the joy and the glory

¹ See Cunningham on "S. Austin," p. 116.

² *Conversion of the Roman Empire*, p. 146.

must be!" He looks forward to a "felicity which will be certain, calm, everlasting, where no evil will exist, where no good will be out of view, and we shall be occupied in the praise of God, who will be all things in all! . . . Where the spirit wills, there the body will be: nor will the spirit will anything which can be unbecoming to spirit or body. There will be true glory, where no one will be praised by mistake or by flattery; true honour, which will not be denied to any one worthy, nor bestowed on any one unworthy . . . true peace, where no one will suffer any adversity, either from himself or from any one else. The reward of virtue will be He Himself who has given virtue, and promised to it Himself, than whom there can be nothing greater or better.¹ What else is that which He spake by the prophet, 'I will be their God,' . . . that is, I will be that whence they may be satisfied, I will be all things that men can honourably desire, life, health, food, abundance, glory, honour, peace, all good things? For this is the true sense of the words, 'that God may be all things in all.' He Himself will be the end of our desires, who will be seen without end, loved without satiety, praised

¹ In De Trin. viii. 4 and De Civ. Dei, xi. 28 he speaks of God as *the* Good, essentially All-good. So far is he from regarding God as mere irresistible "Omnipotence."

without weariness. . . . In that city there will be a free will in all its inmates,—one in all, and inseparable in each,—a will freed from all evil and filled with all good, enjoying unfailingly the delight of joys eternal, forgetful of faults, forgetful of punishments, but yet not so forgetful of its deliverances as not to be thankful to its Deliverer!"

The "strain" that could rise to this "soul-enthralling" loftiness dies down, at the close, in tones of tender simplicity: "I think that by the Lord's help I have fulfilled my obligation in regard to this lengthy work. Let those who think I have said too little, or too much, excuse me; let those who are satisfied give thanks, not to me, but with me, as congratulating me, to my God. Amen."

APPENDIX XIV.

THAT the "Quicunque Vult," commonly called the Athanasian Creed, is more Augustinian than Athanasian, and reproduces what Augustine frequently asserted when writing on the Trinity or the Incarnation, is well known; but a few illustrations may be in place.

Take the treatise *De Trinitate*: "The Father is God, and the Son is God, the Holy Spirit is God, . . . yet we do not call that supreme Trinity itself three Gods, but one God." After similar language, in

which the terms used are “great” and “good,” we read, “Accordingly the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, the Holy Spirit Almighty ; yet they are not three AlUIThIES, but one Almighty” (v. 9.)

“The Father only is Father, and not Father of two Sons, but of an only Son. Nor are there three Sons, since the Father is not Son, nor is the Holy Spirit ; nor three Holy Spirits, because the Holy Spirit, properly so called, . . . is neither Father nor Son :” vii. 7. Cp. c. Sermon. Arian. c. 15.

“So entire is the equality in this Trinity, that not only is the Father not greater than the Son as touching His Godhead, but neither are the Father and the Son together something greater than the Holy Spirit :” viii. proem. So in iv. 29 the Holy Spirit is said to proceed both “*α Patre*” and “*α Filio*,” the same preposition being used in the Quicunque. The formula, “Not three Gods, nor three AlUITHIES, but one God Almighty,” recurs in De Civ. Dei, xi. 24.

So c. Sermonem Arianorum, c. 15, “There are three, and each one of them is God, yet they are not three Gods, etc.”

Again, c. Maximinum Arian. Ep. ii. c. 22 : “The Catholic faith, which neither confounds nor separates the Trinity, which neither denies the three Persons nor believes the substances to be diverse.” Ib. c.

23: "In that Trinity, which is God, there is one Father, not two or three; one Son, not two or three; one Spirit of both, not two or three." Ib. ii. 10: "The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, and at the same time these three are one God."

So in *De Fide et Symbolo*, s. 17: "We call the Father God, the Son God, the Holy Spirit God; but yet not three Gods in this Trinity, but one God and one substance."

Again, the inferiority of the Son to the Father is repeatedly explained with reference to the Manhood (as afterwards in the "Tome of St. Leo"). So in the *Enchiridion*, 35: "He became inferior while He remained equal, One being both . . . on account of the Word, equal to the Father,—on account of the Manhood (*hominem*), inferior." So, c. *Serm. Arian.* 9, he urges that the words, "My Father is greater than I," refer to the Manhood. So c. *Maximin.* i. 19, "On account of the form of a servant the Son said, The Father is greater than I," and ii. 23, "The Son was subjected to the Father when He took the form of a servant."

The clause in the *Quicunque*, "Not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh," according to an Apollinarian fantasy,¹ is very like a passage in

¹ Many Apollinarians imagined that the body of Christ was

Enchiridion, 34 : “The Word was made flesh, not that God was changed into flesh, but that flesh was assumed by Godhead.”

Lastly, the illustration from “the reasonable soul and the flesh” is found in Enchiridion, 36 : “As any man whatever, that is, the reasonable soul and the flesh, is one person, so Christ is one Person, God and Man ;” and Epist. 137. 11 : “As soul is united to body in oneness of person, so as to be man, so God is united to man in oneness of Person, so as to be Christ.” Cp. c. Serm. Ar. c. 8.

APPENDIX XV.

“EVERY reader of St. Augustine,” says Dr. Mozley, in his “Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination,” “is familiar with a certain view of the nature of evil to which he constantly recurs, and which he seems to cherish in his mind as a great moral discovery, a fundamental set-off and answer to the great difficulty of the existence of evil, and the true and perfect mode of extricating the Divine attribute of power from the responsibility of permitting it—the position, viz. that evil is nothing,

formed out of a heavenly or Divine substance. See Later Treatises of Athanasius, Lib. Fath., p. 80.

nihil. God was the source, and, as being the source of, included and comprised all existence; evil was a departure from God; evil, therefore, was a departure from existence; external to God, it was outside of all being and substance, *i.e.* was no-being or nothing" (p. 271).

To take one or two passages: in the Confessions, iii. 12, Augustine says, referring to his Manichean days, "I was moved, as it were, through sharpness of wit, to agree with foolish deceivers when they asked me, Whence is evil? . . . As yet I knew not that evil was nothing but a privation of good, extending at last to a cessation of existence." Ib. vii. 18, after laying it down that only that which remains immutably can be said really to exist, he goes on, "If things shall be deprived of all good, they will not exist at all; therefore, while they exist, they are good; therefore, whatsoever exists is good. As for that evil, the origin of which I used to seek for, it is not a substantive thing, for, if it were, it would be good."

So in his *De Moribus Manichæorum*, 11, he tells how, when a certain person had maintained that evil was not a substantive thing, he himself, somewhat impressed, had quoted it to a leading Manichean, whom he "used frequently to hear in familiar intercourse," and who replied, "I should

like to put a scorpion into that man's hand, and see whether he would not draw his hand away; if he did, he would be convinced, not by words but by reality, that evil *was* a substantive thing, since that animal was undeniably substantive," *i.e.* really existent. Afterwards Augustine reflected that the venomous character of the scorpion was necessary to *its* existence, however injurious to men. Evil, therefore, was simply an "inconvenientia inimica substantiæ,"—a condition harmful to the existence of this or that being. So again, *De Civ. Dei*, xi. 9: "There is no nature of evil, but the loss of good has acquired the name of evil." *Ib.* 22: "Evil is no nature at all, and the name (of evil) belongs only to privation of good."

"Such an explanation as this," Mozley proceeds, "is no real explanation of the difficulty. It is undoubtedly the first truth of religion that true being and good are identical. . . . But how comes there to be being which is not true being? On the religious ground, and as believers in a God, we say that evil cannot be an existing thing, because God is the Author of everything, and yet not the author of evil. But plain common sense tells us clearly that evil exists, and exists just as really as good." One would rather say, "on the religious ground," that no being is evil by creation, but that

moral evil has come in as a perversion of the Creator's gift of moral choice. Mozley attributes Augustine's "vain solution" of what a forgotten but powerful English poet¹ has called

"That dire dilemma on the cause of ill"

to forgetfulness of the mystery which hangs around the idea of Divine omnipotence, in relation to the moral creation. We do not, he says, know all that Omnipotence thus implies; we have an idea of it, "true as far as it goes, but imperfect;" the perplexity as to the co-existence of evil with God's omnipotence refers to the point where our idea has "stopped short." This, indeed, is to give no answer but that we cannot expect one to be given. Professor Flint gives the usual answer, from the necessities of moral probation: "The determination to create moral beings was a determination to create beings who should be the causes of their own actions, and who might set aside His own law. It was a determination to limit His own will to that extent, and in that manner." Moral evil, then, "resulted from the exercise of an original good gift which He had bestowed on certain of His creatures, who could abuse that gift, but were not necessitated to abuse it:" On Theism, p. 255, ff.² He adds, "It is merely in so

¹ Moile, "State Trials."

² Cp. Liddon, Adv. Serm. ii. 112.

far as physical evil is dissociated from moral evil that its existence is a problem and a perplexity ;" and even so it can be largely accounted for, as a means to a good end in a creation subjected to vanity. In the words of the poet above quoted—

" What says your prophet ? Why was evil sent ?
God will redress ? Why did not God prevent ? . . .
Faith answers, Sin and pain obtained their place,
To serve man's freedom and display God's grace," etc.

APPENDIX XVI.

IT is an instance of the irony of history that the main question of fact, as distinct from the question of principle, between the African Catholics and the Donatists arose out of a forged paragraph added by a Christian, from motives of personal spite, to a letter addressed by an honest Pagan gentleman, under false representations, to a bishop. The story opens at the beginning of the Great Persecution in 303. We find Alsius Cæcilianus (whom, to avoid confusion with Cæcilian of Carthage, we may conveniently designate by his first name) acting as duumvir or chief magistrate in the city of Aptunga, in the province of Pro-consular Africa. After some communication with his Christian fellow-townsmen, he anticipates the

expected imperial edict by causing the episcopal chair, and some “letters of salutation” from neighbouring prelates to Felix, the bishop, then absent, to be taken out of the Christian church, the doors of which are afterwards burned. Years pass away, and peace has been restored to the Church, when Alfius, then at breakfast with his workmen, sees a visitor in the doorway: it is a Christian named Ingentius, holding the respectable position of a “decurio,” or town councillor, at Zigga, in the same province. “I have come,” he said, “to ask whether any copy of the Scriptures was burned in the year of your duumvirate.” Alfius, who had begun by an offer of hospitality, resented a question which might put him to inconvenience. “You are a trouble to me, you have been suborned; take yourself off (*laxa hinc te a me*).” Ingentius departs, but returns with Augentius, who had served with Alfius as *aedile*, and under whom Ingentius had then acted as secretary. They explain their errand by producing a supposed letter from Felix to Ingentius; would he ask the ex-duumvir to certify in writing that eleven valuable copies of Scripture had been burned in his year of office, and so to relieve Felix from the necessity of restoring them to the owner, who was now reclaiming what he had long ago lent? The description of this

owner as “perditus nescio qui” appears to be part of an oral comment by Ingentius on the pretended message. Alfius, as an upright man, is shocked. “Is this,” he asks, “what Christians call honesty?” He is, however, persuaded to dictate a note for Felix. In it he confines himself to the fact, that at the time in question a Christian removed some “letters” from the “basilica;” and, after saying this, he concludes, “I hope, dear and venerable sir (*parens*), that you may keep your health for many years.” He then entrusts the note to Ingentius, little suspecting that this man had a vindictive purpose of his own. Felix had publicly denounced, as a simoniac, Bishop Maurus of Utica, who had shown kindness to Ingentius when he fled from his own town in the persecution. Ingentius retorted, “And *you* are a traditor!” *i.e.* “you betrayed your trust by giving up the sacred books to be destroyed.” This charge required to be substantiated: Ingentius determined to make evidence; and he did so by first concocting a letter as *from* Felix, and then by adding to Alfius’s letter *to* Felix a passage of which the main point was a reminder: “You know you sent me word to take the key of the church, and to remove any books or manuscripts which I might find there.” The double fraud succeeded; great pains were

taken to circulate the calumny ; it became a stock argument on the part of the Donatists—"Who consecrated Cæcilian, the 'Catholic' bishop of Carthage ?—who but Felix—Felix 'the traditor' ?" "Wearied," as Augustine expresses it, by such representations, Constantine ordered the question of fact, "Had Felix surrendered the Scriptures ?" to be formally tried by the proconsul *Ælian*us at Carthage. Before his tribunal the ex-duumvir, then an elderly man, appeared as a witness, and repeatedly affirmed that he had dictated up to the farewell greeting in the letter, and that the postscript, so to call it, was a forgery by *Ingentius*, who, when actually fastened on the rack, and momentarily expecting to be tortured, admitted that he "had done wrong, had added the words in question to the letter, out of anger on account of his host *Maurus*." *Ælian*us, while interrogating him, bore significant testimony to the reputation of Christians for truthfulness ; "Do not tell lies—*that* seems foreign to Christians!" The end of it was that the proconsul pronounced Felix to be wholly innocent of the charge of traditorship. "Felix was not in Aptunga at the time ; he had no knowledge of, he never ordered, anything of the kind." The sentence is quoted by Augustine in his third book against *Cresconius* the Donatist. In another work

he says, "The minutes of the proconsular trial are extant; any one can take and read them :" *De Unico Baptismo*, 28. Some twelve years earlier, he had referred to that "most careful inquiry" as having established the innocence of Felix : *Ep. 43.*

5. The Donatists handed down in their sect a version of the story which came out at the Conference of Carthage in 411. "The judge, of course, was partial—the evidence had been cooked." They also ventured on the statement that when, after the proconsular trial, Constantine sent for Ingentius (whom *Ælianu*s had ordered to be detained as a prisoner), his representations actually changed the Emperor's view of the case : *Ep. 141.* 11. It seems as if they were recklessly ready to say anything in defiance of evidence ; as Augustine drily remarks, they urged "whatever men are wont to throw out, in the way of highly suspicious objection, against records which overthrow their case :" *Brevic. Collat. 42.*

Those records, the "Gesta Purgationis Felicis," contained in the appendix to the ninth volume of *St. Augustine*, are reprinted with conjectural emendations in the fourth volume of *Routh's "Reliquiae Sacrae."* Canon Mason has rendered nearly the whole document into racy English, in his vivid narrative of the "Diocletian Persecution."

APPENDIX XVII.

AUGUSTINE'S idea of an "interior" Church is not to be confounded with that of an "invisible" Church as held by many Protestants, and emphasised by the Pietists of Germany, according to which the sacredness and glory pertaining to the Church in the New Testament are wholly detached from the Church visible, and restricted to a minority of pious souls "regarded as belonging indifferently to any or no ecclesiastical unity :" see Gore, *The Ministry of the Church*, p. 19. Those who hold this view are accustomed to regard visible or organised Christian societies as naturally formed by a drawing together of individuals who have independently been brought into union with Christ. Perhaps they suspect a "Romanising tendency," or at least they imagine a defect of spirituality, in language which connects the corporate life of Christians with the purposes of Christ as the Founder of a Divine kingdom, or with the security of His covenanted gifts. Not such was Augustine's line of thought when he said that persons "could not be regarded as in Christ's body, which is the Church, merely because they were physically partakers of the sacrament" (c. Litt. Petil. ii. 247); or that "those who hear His words and do them not

are upon the sand, and therefore are external to the Rock, and therefore to the Church" (de Bapt. vi. 44); or when he referred to "the holy Church in the predestinate" as "Christ's body" (in Jo. Ev. Tr. 26. 15). He was thinking of those members of the visible body who realised their privileges and their obligations, who were Christians inwardly as well as outwardly, and of them, moreover, as the objects of a Divine predestinating election. His "true Church," so called, is a subdivision of the visible Church, and consists of its worthy members. Any Christian writer might say that bad Christians were "not true Christians;" he might apply to them the words of the ancient Song, "They are not His children, this is their blemish" (Deut. xxxii. 5); he might adopt the significant laconism of the Apostle, and pronounce that those who were externally in the Christian society, but morally alien to its spirit and ideas, were "not of" it. But Augustine added to this view the more esoteric view of an "interior" Church as containing those only who were predestined to adhere permanently or "perseveringly" to their Lord; in presence of that mysterious decree, temporary adhesion, even at its best, would seem to fall short of vital and effectual membership; he looked to the end, and read the present in the light of the future. This explains

his often misapprehended use of “*res sacramenti*,” not for the “inward part” of the Eucharist, the sacred “thing” of which the visible elements are symbols, but for the permanent “fellowship” of the predestinate with Christ (in *Jo. Ev. Tr.* 26. 15). But, for all this, he never lost sight of the visible Church as a Divine institution; on the contrary, he has been often accused of making too much of it, of exaggerating the dignity of a “merely external” organisation. He recognises it, not only as Christ’s Church, but as Christ’s body; for instance, he says, “that whosoever depart from the Holy Scriptures as to the Head of the body Himself, though they may be found in all places where the Church is present to view, are not in the Church; and again, whosoever agree with the Scriptures as to the Head Himself, and do not partake in the unity of the Church, are not in the Church:” *De Unit. Eccl.* 4. He is speaking, as the context shows, of no ideal or indiscernible unity, but of the Catholic Church, as a city set on a hill. So in the minutes of the Conference with the Donatists, we find his own words reported thus: “We hold to that Church which we have found in those Scriptures wherein also we have recognised Christ. . . . They present to us Christ and the Church as united in holy marriage, Christ as Bridegroom, the Church as bride.

Accordingly, if we were now considering to what community of Christians in Africa we should attach ourselves, we should undoubtedly be bound to adhere to that which we found in the Scriptures. This is what the African Christians have done, and they are called, and with good reason, Catholics : ” Mansi, Concil. iii. 202. And in his own summary of this Conference he says, that whereas the Donatists taxed the Catholics with believing in *two* Churches, the Catholics explained themselves to mean that the very self-same one and holy Church was now in one condition,” as “ having bad mingled with good, and hereafter would be in another, . . . even as it does not follow that there are two Christs, because at first He died, and afterwards was to die no more : ” Brevic. Collat. 3. 20.

This shows quite clearly that his “ interior Church ” was simply the kernel of the Church visible,—it was the Church visible *minus* those who hereafter would be eliminated as having no part in her true life. A passage which might at first sight imply the entire independence, so to speak, of the interior Church, is in De Bapt. v. 38 : “ In the ineffable foreknowledge of God, many who are apparently without are within, and many who are apparently within are without.” But by those who are apparently without he means, as the

preceding words show, some who are at present in heresy or in heathenism, but who, in God's good time, will be admitted to the interior fellowship of Christ's true servants, because "the Lord knoweth them that are His." Would their admission to the "sealed fountain and enclosed garden" take place otherwise than through the visible Church? Augustine would have unhesitatingly answered in the negative. As he says in *Civ. Dei*, i. 35, "The redeemed family of Christ the Lord, the pilgrim city of Christ the King, will remember that even among her enemies are concealed those who will be her citizens, and so she will not think it profitless to bear with their hostility until she can meet them as confessors of her faith." Another similar passage is in *Enarr. in Ps. 106. s. 14*; he quotes the same text, and says, "Those who are not ours, and (yet) are, as it were, within our body, go out when they have found occasions; and those who are ours, and are, as it were, without, return when they have found occasions."

It may be added that Augustine's predestination did not prevent him from holding that grace, which in default of predestination could be but temporary, was yet, while it lasted, real: that many non-elect had been actually regenerated in baptism, and endued with love, and enabled to live

piously,—only, since they were not predestined to abide in the moral reality of sonship and discipleship, they were not sons and disciples from the standpoint of God's foreknowledge (*apud eum*). See the *De Correptione et Gratia*, 18, 22.

APPENDIX XVIII.

AUGUSTINE repeatedly insists on the truth that Christ Himself is the true Agent in the administration of His own ordinances, although He uses the instrumentality of man. Thus, *De Baptismo*, iii. 15 : “Christ’s Baptism, being consecrated by the words of the Gospel, is holy, even although it be administered by adulterers and to adulterers, . . . because His holiness cannot be polluted, and the Divine power is present with His own sacrament, either for the salvation of those who use it well, or for the ruin of those who use it ill.” *Ib. vi. 47* : “He Himself sanctifies His own sacrament.” So *c. Litt. Petil. iii. 59* : “When we say that Christ baptises, we do not mean that He does so by visibly administering it—as Petilianus thinks, or wishes it to be thought, that we say,—but by secret grace, by secret power in the Holy Spirit, as it was said of Him by John the Baptist, ‘This is He who baptiseth in the Holy Spirit.’ Nor has He, as

Petilianus says, now ceased to baptise. He still performs that work, not by corporeally ministering, but by an invisible operation of [His] majesty. When we say, He Himself baptises, we do not mean that He Himself holds, and washes in the water, the bodies of believers; but that He Himself invisibly cleanses,—and cleanses, moreover, the universal Church" (quoting Eph. v. 26). "See, it is Christ that sanctifies; see, it is Christ also that Himself washes by that very laver of water in the word, where ministers are seen corporeally to act." He goes on to speak of ministers as "stewards," who have to distribute the Lord's provision of food to fellow-servants.

So, in Joan. Evan. Tract. 15. 3, on the text, John i. 33; "Jesus, therefore, is still baptising; and, as long as we have to be baptised, Jesus baptises us. Let a man approach with confidence to the minister who is below, for he has a Master who is above."

This language is precisely in accord with that of St. Ambrose—"It was not Damasus that cleansed, it was not Peter, it was not Ambrose, it was not Gregory; for the ministrations are ours, but the sacraments are Thine; for neither is it within human power to confer what is Divine, but the gift is Thine, O Lord, and the Father's" (De Spir.

Sanct. i. prol. 18); and with St. Chrysostom's—“Believe that even now the Supper is that at which He Himself sat down. There is no difference between the two. It is not that a man acts in the one, and He in the other, but rather He in both. When, then, you see the priest administering to you, do not think that is the priest who is doing this, but that it is Christ's hand which is being extended. For as, when you are being baptised, it is not the priest who is baptising you, but it is God who is holding your head with invisible power, . . . so also in this case; for whereas God alone regenerates, to Him alone belongs the gift” (in Matt. Hom. 50. 3).

The same caveat against a perversion of “sacerdotalism” is found in St. Thomas Aquinas. God alone, he says, is the “*Agens principalis*” in the sacraments; in this sense He alone “*operatur interiorem effectum sacramenti*:” man can act only as an instrument. Thus the priests do not infuse grace, but only impart the sacraments of grace: Sum. iii. 64. 1. He adds that Christ operates in sacraments “*per auctoritatem*” as *God*, but as *Man* has “*potestatem ministerii principalis, sive potestatem excellentiæ*,” in that (1) the “merit and virtue of His Passion operate instrumentally,” under His Godhead, “in the sacraments; (2) in

His Name the sacraments are hallowed ; (3) He Himself, who gave virtue to sacraments, could institute sacraments ; and (4) He can bestow the effect of sacraments, without an outward sacrament ;” and this pre-eminent power He forbore to communicate to His ministers, not because He could not have done so, but “lest the faithful should put their trust in man,—lest there should be diverse sacraments, whereby division might arise in the Church (1 Cor. i. 12–17), and lest the ministers should be heads of the Church in a secondary sense :” ib. 64. 3 and 4. The principle maintained in our Twenty-sixth Article is stated in the next “article” of Aquinas : “The ministers of the Church neither cleanse from sins the persons who approach the sacraments, nor confer grace by their own power ; *sed hoc facit Christus sua potestate per eos, sicut per quædam instrumenta.*”¹

¹ Compare Imit. Chr. iv. (properly iii.) 5. “*Sacerdos quidem minister Dei est, utens verbo Dei per jussionem et institutionem ejus : Deus autem ibi principalis est auctor et invisibilis operator.*” In Enarr. in Ps. 145 (= 146) Augustine turns the tables on the Donatists, who, in maintaining the opposite principle, puzzled simple Church-folk by such questions as, “Can a famishing man feed others? [i.e. Can a sinner give what is holy?] . . . Can one who is bound unloose?” “*Quid est quod te, hæretice, jactas, quia tu solvis, tu erigis, tu illuminas? . . . It is the Lord who looseth the fettered,*” etc.

APPENDIX XIX.

THE Pelagians admitted the word “grace” in several senses, all of them inadequate. When Augustine first read a certain passage in the treatise which Timasius and James had desired him to consider, and which he describes in his work “On Nature and Grace” without naming Pelagius as its alleged author, he was delighted, he tells us, to find a recognition of Divine “grace;” but, on further reading, and especially in view of the illustrations employed, he became convinced that “grace” was only used as a name for the natural endowment of free will, received by man at his creation. So he says of the same treatise, in a letter to the Bishop of Jerusalem, “What in that book he calls grace is only the nature in which we have been formed with free will” (Ep. 179. 3). When the bishops in the “Council of Palestine” accepted the recognition of “grace” on the part of Pelagius, they did so on the mistaken assumption that he meant, “not that grace whereby we were created as human beings, but that whereby we have been adopted into a new creation” (De Gest. Pel. 22). He even anathematised, for their satisfaction, all who held

that “God’s grace and help was not given with a view to men’s several actions, but consisted in free will, or in the (moral) law and teaching :” and this involved the admission of a grace which consisted in help as “supplied by the Holy Spirit for such actions,—wherefore we always pray for *auxilium opportunum*” (ib. 31).

Here, then, was a second inadequate sense of grace—instruction in matters of duty ; it was inadequate because, although any light thrown on the question, “What must I do ?” was unquestionably a Divine gift, yet it did not come sufficiently home to the inward being ; it did not directly touch the will and the heart. The point is again referred to in *De Grat. Chr.* 3, 8, 11, where Augustine observes that the idea of grace, properly so called, is not satisfied by “a revelation of moral wisdom, or by admonitions to follow what is good.” Such admonitions, as he urges in the “*De Spiritu et Littera*,” might only “work death” by irritating the rebellious instinct of selfwill, so that “the stream of man’s corruptions would fret and rage more furiously for the obstacle placed in its way, as some mountain torrent foams” with “fiercer activity round a rock that has fallen in its bed” (Trench on St. Augustine as an Interpreter of Scripture, p. 127 ; compare Rom. vii. 8 ff.).

A third sense of grace, more distinctively Christian, but still falling short of the required mark, would be the “gift” of a perfect moral exemplar in Christ. Augustine says that this sense is suggested by several passages in the treatises of Pelagius (De Grat. Chr. 38). He himself loved to dwell on the pattern of humility exhibited in the Lord Incarnate (see De Agone Christiano, 12) : in his long letter (Ep. 140) on “the Grace of the New Testament,” he points repeatedly to the teaching of that supreme Example which in his book on “True Religion” he had called “disciplina morum.” He was little likely to underestimate the power of its appeals to the conscience of every one who called Christ Master. But still, it was but illuminative and persuasive ; it did not, of itself, impart the requisite impulse ; nor did the forgiveness of sins, which in the “De Gratia Christi” is referred to as also called “grace” in the Pelagian theology. All these were gifts of God ; but something more than all these was wanted for the moral recovery of man’s enfeebled and tainted nature ; and that “something more” was not really recognised by Pelagius.

It has, indeed, been said by a great writer on this controversy that the Pelagians did include in the idea of grace “those internal Divine impulses

and spiritual assistances commonly denoted by the words," and this on the ground of Pelagius's words quoted in *De Grat. Chr.* 8, and of stronger language quoted from Julian in *Op. Imp. c. Jul. iii.* 106 (Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Predest.* p. 54). But the first of these passages speaks of "grace" only as illuminative; and the second says that God "makes known His benignity by commanding, by blessing, by sanctifying, by constraining, by exciting, by illuminating,"—where the context dwells on that revelation of things hidden from the wise which was unattainable by mere free will, and thus limits the scope of the words cited to such assistance as might instruct men on the requirements of the "cultus Dei." This is not the Catholic conception of grace as a Divine power operating, not only on the intellect, but also on the affections and the will.

APPENDIX XX.

AUGUSTINE was informed, probably about the year 427, that Vitalis, a Carthaginian Christian, acknowledged the necessity of real grace—*i.e.* of a movement or energy of the Holy Spirit on the will and affections—for all good acts subsequent

to the initial act of faith, which he referred to the unassisted will ; explaining Phil. ii. 13 to mean that God, through Scripture, made external appeals to the conscience, but did not inwardly enable the conscience to respond to them. As against this view, Augustine argued, in an elaborate letter (Ep. 217), from the Church prayers offered up for the conversion of unbelievers, that faith was believed to be actually a gift. He sums up thus : “ If, as I am disposed to believe about you, you agree with us that we ought, and are wont, to pray to God for those who are not willing to believe, that they may be willing to believe, and for those who oppose and contradict His law and doctrine, that they may believe it and follow it, . . . that we also ought, and are wont, to give thanks to God for such persons when they are converted to the faith and doctrine, and become willing instead of not-willing,—then you ought undoubtedly to acknowledge that the wills of men are anticipated (*præveniri*) by God’s grace, and that God makes them will the good as to which they were unwilling,” etc.

From other language in this letter it is evident that this “ prevenient ” action of grace was regarded by Augustine as dominant and determinative. The Divine “ preparation of the will ”

is, with him, a process in which the will is purely passive ; the conversion of the unbeliever is effected “omnipotentissima facilitate ;” and Augustine does not shrink from representing “the priest of God at His altar as exhorting the people to pray, or himself praying with a loud voice, that He would *compel* the unbelieving nations to come to the faith in Him.” There is no admission of any capacity in the will to resist the grace which thus takes hold of it ; on the contrary, such capacity is advisedly put out of the question.¹ This letter, therefore, which also exhibits Augustine’s unnatural interpretation of 1 Tim. ii. 4 as meaning “None are saved except by the action of God’s own will,” —and which virtually holds an infant responsible for the parents’ neglect to bring it to baptism and to the Eucharist,—may fittingly introduce us to the difficulties felt and expressed by the learned Churchmen of Southern Gaul at a slightly later period, and especially to the error into which they were betrayed with reference to the initial act of faith, or the first good motion of the will.

Of these the chief were John Cassian, who had

¹ Dr. Stoughton, in his “Religion in England,” iv. 269, says that Truman, an opponent of Bishop Bull, “anticipated the opinions of modern Calvinists” by “representing grace as a Divine influence *securing* the obedience of the will to the gospel of Christ.”

been ordained deacon by Chrysostom, had founded two monastic houses at Marseilles, and had written, about A.D. 420, twelve books on the monastic life as led by the ascetics, or “renouncers,” of Egypt,—and Hilary, who, after having been “a model monk in the very best and highest sense”¹ in the isle of Lerins, was constrained to succeed his friend Honoratus, the founder of that illustrious monastery, in the metropolitan see of Arles. In this same year, 429, two letters² were addressed to Augustine by Prosper, of Aquitaine, and by another Hilary, a layman, to inform him of objections in which they themselves were far from concurring, but which were taken by the new archbishop of Arles, and by the general body of the ecclesiastics in the neighbourhood of Marseilles—some of them bishops, and all of them men of high character—to the views expressed in the treatise “On Correction and Grace,” which Augustine had written by way of explaining his own predestinarianism to certain monks of Adu-

¹ See the account of this Hilary in *Dict. Chr. Biogr.* iii. 67, ff. “If . . . we are compelled to class Hilary of Arles with the Semi-Pelagians, it must be recognised that he is a supporter of their views in the very mildest form.” He was on intimate terms with the anti-Pelagian St. German.

² Aug. Epp. 225, 226. Hooker, by a strange oversight, identifies this Hilary with the bishop.

metum, and in which the irresistibleness of grace had been laid down in the plainest terms. The treatise had been circulated in Southern Gaul ; and the theologians referred to had read it with grave dissatisfaction. They were acquainted with Augustine's letter to Paulinus (Ep. 186), but not with the letter to Sixtus (Ep. 194 ; cf. *De Dono Perseverantiae*, 55). They held that predestination must not be represented as absolute, but as conditioned by the Divine foresight of man's readiness to believe and obey. The Augustinian theory on this subject appeared to them not only opposed to Christian traditions, but distinctly unfavourable to Christian practice. In their opinion, it cut at the root of moral effort ;¹ it led straight to fatalism, or to Manicheism ; it threw open the door to speculations at once superfluous and unedifying. They rejected the notion of a fixed number of the elect, and insisted that the Scriptural assurances as to the universality of God's benignant will should be taken simply, and not explained away. "That propitiation," they said, "which consists in the mystery of the blood of Christ, is offered to all men without exception, so that whosoever are willing to come to the faith and to baptism may

¹ "Removeri . . . omnem industriam" . . . "excludi putant omnem prædicandi vigorem."

be saved. . . . So far as pertains to God, eternal life has been prepared for all." They admitted the Fall, and the transmission of a corruption of nature ; they also acknowledged the necessity and the reality of grace, but of grace as subsequent to man's unaided choice of good, not as prevenient or originative, although some of them applied the name of grace to that natural power of the will, the right use of which, as they held, would bring a man on to the reception of Christian grace, in the proper sense of the term.

Here, then, lay the exact point of difference between Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism : the former does not recognise grace in the full or proper sense of the term ; the latter does recognise it, but only as a necessary aid to those moral efforts which follow upon the first movement of the soul towards God—that movement itself being regarded as independent of grace. Why did the Gallic divines take up with such a theory ? Because Augustine's notion of grace as bestowed on the elect only, as absolutely necessitating its own reception on their part, and as wholly unattainable by those who were not of their number, might encourage at once negligence and despair ; because exhortations proceeding on the supposition of a capacity to hearken and to profit would be

useless for the larger class, and superfluous for the smaller ; because, therefore, it seemed necessary to provide a sphere for free will, and therein for moral responsibility. Now, if Augustine had admitted that grace was in fact resistible and not determinative, such a sphere would have been gained at once, and no controversy on that point would have arisen. But as he persistently maintained the opposite view, the Gallic critics—among whom Hilary, at any rate, is said to have agreed with him on all other points of doctrine—were tempted to find the requisite scope for freedom by treating the will, in its unassisted state, as capable of a “suppliant desire” for moral “healing.” They said in effect, “The initial movement towards God must be man’s own act purely and simply ; after it, grace will come in, but as auxiliary, and in this sense co-operative.” Herein, unquestionably, they were wrong. As Hooker expresses it, “The whole question of grace being grown into this sense, whether man may” (*i.e.* can) “without God seek God, and without grace either desire or accept grace first offered, the conclusion of the Catholic part was—No” (E. P. v. App. No. 1). Grace must have a function in regard to the very beginnings of piety : and this, it seems, would have been easily perceived if Augustine had described its

function in terms less absolute ; if he had admitted that, while grace awakened what otherwise would have been dormant, and invigorated what otherwise would have been powerless, it still left the will free either to resist the stimulus thus given, or to use the power thus placed within its reach.

Prosper and the layman Hilary requested Augustine to write something which might meet the Gallic objections. He complied by writing two treatises, "On the Predestination of the Saints," and "On the Gift of Perseverance." But instead of removing difficulties, he rather increased them. He begins, indeed, by fairly recognising the differences between Pelagianism proper and the opinion which held real grace to be necessary for all but the first step. He confesses that he himself, many years before, had regarded faith as *not* a result of grace (cf. *Exp. Propos. ex Ep. ad Rom. 60*) ; but he explains, "I had not at that time discovered the true character of the election of grace." He presses home his favourite argument, that as God was not bound to deliver or to teach any of those who were under a common condemnation on account of the Fall, the reason why some are not taught or delivered is simply that He does not choose to give them grace ;¹ he insists on the

¹ Cp. *De Præd. Sanct. 14, 16* ; *De Dono Persev. 16*.

word “make,”¹ in reference to the action of grace on the soul, as if it implied an overmastering energy; thus he says, “Ipse facit ut illi faciant quæ præcepit” (De Præd. Sanct. 19). Nothing short of this, he contends, would meet the need. He owns that reserve should be used in the exposition of other truths, but contends that it is out of place in regard to election, although in public discourses it ought not to be supposed that any non-elect persons were present. They should be spoken *of*, not spoken to; the hearers should be urged to pray for perseverance, and to trust that they are among the predestined to salvation.² He endeavours to make out an inconsistency in the Gallicans’ view of good works subsequent to the first movement of faith, in that they owned such works to be “gifts.” But they did not regard them as gifts which could not be refused; and this was just the point on which he insisted, as he did also on the pure absoluteness of the Divine decree, electing some to salvation, and “abandoning”³ the

¹ In such liturgical prayers as “*Make us to love that which Thou dost command*,” there is always pre-supposed an intention of responding to the grace thus asked for—such intention being itself a response to prior grace.

² See De Dono Persev. 40, 58, ff.

³ “*In massa perditionis justo divino judicio relinquuntur*” (De Dono Persev. 35).

rest. Thus it has been truly observed, that, "inasmuch as he still teaches an arbitrary election, a grace which is *strictly* controlling, and a will which is only a will, and not a free will, he does not satisfy the natural doubts of the Church of Marseilles ; and therefore the real objections raised by them to his teaching, based, as they were, on truth and reason, still remain."¹ Although, then, the "Massilians" who read these treatises would appreciate the humility of that concluding passage in which the venerable writer said, "When I become not only better instructed, but practically improved by means of those who read my books, I acknowledge God's goodness to me, and this I expect mainly by means of teachers of the Church," they were not reclaimed from the erroneous position which they had assumed ; and a precious opportunity was lost through the theological absolutism which secures intensity at the heavy cost of onesidedness, which raises up stumbling-blocks and is unable to take them away.

It should be added that Prosper himself, an ardent and thoroughgoing "Augustinian," was successful in showing that Cassian was inconsistent in that he admitted the preventient action of grace in certain cases, though not in all,—that, in fact,

¹ See Chr. Remembr., Jan. 1856, p. 162.

he took up “informe nescio quid tertium, et utrique parti inconveniens” (*Contra Collatorem*, 8). For himself, Prosper rigidly adheres to the theory of an absolute predestination and a determinative grace, and keeps it before him in his verbal admissions of free will.¹

This Semi-Pelagian controversy was closed, in effect, by the pronouncements of the Second Council of Orange in 529.² The propositions adopted by this small but remarkable assembly do indeed imply the Augustinian language about grace as “making” men pray for grace, but do not of themselves involve the irresistibleness of its operation. They affirm, for instance, that “it is through the infusion and inspiration of the Holy Spirit that we believe, will, or are able to act aright;” but this is consistent with holding that the infusion and inspiration can be frustrated through man’s unresponsiveness. Another statement, that “the free will which was weakened in the first man can only be restored through the grace of baptism,” might indeed seem to imply that the convert was purely passive in regard to

¹ See *e.g.* C. Collat. 54. He glosses such texts as “Come unto Me,” etc., and is sometimes evasive, sometimes inconsistent.

² See Woods, *Introduction to Canons of Second Council of Orange*; and Wilberforce, *Doctr. of Baptism*, p. 171.

the impulse to ask for baptism; but it could be accepted in the sense that the entire healing of the disordered will must be attained through incorporation into the body mystical of its Divine Restorer. And since, as Prosper saw and said, the doctrines of determinative grace and of absolute predestination,¹ or not less absolute “detection,” hang logically together, a Council which disowned the second could not consistently admit the first. If, as the bishops at Orange asserted, in accordance with the view ascribed to Hilary of Arles, “all the baptised,” as such, had the means of salvation within their power, so that none of them were excluded by a secret and irreversible decree,² there could be no ground left for maintaining that grace, admittedly real and internal, was unconditional in its operation on recipients.

APPENDIX XXI.

WE are apt sometimes to forget how firm a foothold “Augustinianism” had obtained in the

¹ Ep. ad Rufinum, 12.

² They anathematise any, “if any there be, who hold that some are predestinate to evil.” But Prosper himself had restricted “predestination” to the case of the good: Resp. ad Obj. Vinc. 12.

mediæval schools of theology. The “ Angelic Doctor ” was not only a strong predestinarian, but virtually a maintainer of “ irresistible ” grace. His statements in the 111th “ question ” of the “ Prima Secundæ ” do not appear to leave room for any freedom of the will in regard to what he calls the “ *operatio qua Deus movet nos ad bonum :* ” the soul is conceived of as simply wrought upon ; and even co-operation on its part, after the first or prevenient inspirations of grace, appears to consist simply in the “ *exterior* ” activity proceeding from a will which has been “ *wholly moved to action by grace :* ” see Mozley, p. 288. The Franciscans, in this and some other matters, took a different line from that of the Dominicans ; and the Jesuits were still more energetic in their hostility to Augustinianism. Such opponents could take advantage of the fact that its rigorism had been accentuated in the system of that reformer whose name was specially odious to zealous members of the Roman Church. Accordingly, in the Council of Trent, grace was declared to be at once really originative and *not* determinative, although the language used was such as might give the least possible umbrage to the Dominicans, and save as far as possible the

theological authority of the “Doctor of grace.”¹ This was in 1547; twenty years later, Pius V. condemned the errors of Baius, who has been called “a pertinacious upholder of the action of liberty as opposed, not to moral necessity, but only to external constraint” (Jervis, Hist. Ch. of France, i. 382). The same writer adds that “the growing power of the Jesuits contributed to establish a style of teaching more in accordance with the grand principle of man’s moral freedom and responsibility.” While Baro, as Margaret Professor at Cambridge, was heading an anti-Calvinistic reaction,—while even Whitgift and the divines who assisted him in revising the first draft of the Lambeth Articles were modifying the broad statement that “gratia sufficiens ad salutem” was *not* given to all men, by altering “sufficiens” into “salutaris,” *i.e.* grace such as ultimately ensures salvation, and laying stress on the idea

¹ After asserting that “the beginning of justification in adults” must be traced to “God’s prevenient grace” or “call,” the Council combines the ideas of the “exciting” action of grace and the “free assent” of the will, “ita ut, tangente Deo cor hominis per Spiritus Sancti illuminationem neque homo ipse nihil omnino agat, inspirationem illam recipiens, quippe qui *illam et abdicere potest*, neque tamen sine gratia Dei movere se ad justitiam coram illo libera sua voluntate possit:” Sess. 6 de Justif. c. 5.

of a “power in the will, subordinate to grace, yet capable of consenting to grace”—the Jesuits abroad were going much further. Luis Molina not only maintained the contingent as opposed to the absolute character of predestination, and the offer of “sufficient grace” to all men, but appeared, at any rate, to go very near to Semi-Pelagianism on the subject of grace.¹ This gave occasion to the disheartened Thomists; they stirred up Clement VIII. to appoint a commission—the “Congregatio de Auxiliis”—for fuller inquiry into the matter; and a significant fact in the history of Papal utterances is the announcement by Paul V., in 1607, that the commission was at an end, and that he would announce his decision when he thought fit. He never did think fit; he deemed it unsafe to give a triumph to either party.

But the posthumous publication of the treatise called “Augustinus,” which embodied the lifelong studies of Jansen, bishop of Ypres, put an end to the reticence of Rome. Urban VIII.’s bull, in 1642, condemned the book, but encountered considerable opposition; and not until seven years

¹ For a “charitable” explanation of Molina’s views, see Christian Remembrancer, Jan. 1852, p. 107; Ranke regards them as virtually Semi-Pelagian.

later was the strife concentrated around the Five Propositions which were presented for the judgment of the Sorbonne as containing the essence of Jansen's teaching, and two of which were to the effect that grace was irresistible, while a third declared that the freedom "required in order to merit" was only freedom from exterior constraint. Innocent X. condemned the propositions in 1653, and so did Alexander VII. in 1656. Both Popes implicitly or explicitly committed their see to the assertion that the obnoxious statements were in fact Jansen's; while both were careful to distinguish between what Augustine had meant and what Jansen had supposed him to mean.

Nine months before the promulgation of Alexander's "Constitution," Pascal had begun his immortal "Provincial Letters." He denied that the propositions could be found in the "Augustinus," or that they truly represented the mind of its author; and he turned the keenest edge of his exquisite raillery against the Dominicans, or New Thomists, of his time, whom he describes as shufflers, because they spoke both of a "sufficient" and of an "efficacious" grace. They wanted to retain their own doctrine, and yet to stand well with the Jesuits. The phrase "sufficient grace" would suggest to ordinary hearers the idea of a

real offer to all men of such help as would suffice, on God's part, for the attainment of life eternal. But to speak of an "efficacious" grace beside and beyond this—of such grace as necessary in order to salvation,—and of such grace as given only to the elect, so that "tous ont assez de grace, et tous n'en ont pas assez,—cette grace suffit, quoiqu'elle ne suffit pas,—en bonne foi, mon père, cette doctrine est bien subtile!" But a Pascal on the opposite side, if such a phenomenon had been possible, might have found material for similar sarcasms in the elaborate eighteenth "Provincial Letter," published in March, 1657. One sees that Pascal, too, has his own difficulties. He is bound by the decree of Trent, not to say by mere Papal utterances, to deny that grace is irresistible; and it is of the last importance for him to draw a broad line between the position of the "Jansenists" and that Calvinism of which they are accused. He therefore repeats, over and over again, that the will "has always the power to resist grace," even efficacious and "victorious" grace, and that "man's natural freedom," in this respect, "is in no way destroyed by the unfailing character of God's operation." When man yields, under grace, to the Divine attraction, he does so "by a movement altogether free and voluntary; it is not that

he cannot at any time withdraw himself, and that he would not in fact withdraw himself, if he desired to do so ;” it is that he cannot desire to do so, for his will “must always tend to what pleases it best, and nothing pleases it, in that case, so much as that unique good which includes all other forms of good,”—so that “*le libre arbitre qui peut toujours résister à la grâce, ne le veut pas toujours.*” This sounds well, but it appears on consideration that this impossibility of desiring to withdraw from the touch of grace is involved in that touch itself. So that here we have a will which is “free” not to consent, yet is “made” to consent by the very voice which addresses it ; and a grace which can always be resisted, yet which by its very nature puts resistance out of the question. What Pascal gives with one hand, he takes away with the other ; but so, in effect, did his and Jansen’s patristic oracle ; and he himself had, in his very first “Letter,” practically ruled the question of “resistance” by speaking of efficacious grace as “determinative.”

Our sympathy is so strongly drawn towards the Jansenists by the example of that “ascetic purity, that delicate and noble simplicity of life,” which, as Dean Kitchin pathetically expresses it, was to “the general course of French opinion like the

passing fragrance of violets,"¹—and also, still more, by the odious persecution inflicted on men whose moral independence was an offence to ignorant autocracy, itself the tool of the mighty "company" whose casuists had been pilloried by supreme genius in union with intense spiritual earnestness,—that it is necessary to remember what can be urged on the opposite side in the serious interest of moral responsibility. English Churchmen will generally adopt Möhler's exposition of the "Catholic principle," that grace must indeed "precede, awakening, exciting, vivifying, yet that man must let himself be excited,"—that is, must use the stimulus given to him, although he could do nothing without that stimulus; and that "God's omnipotence suffers human freedom to set to it a bound, which it cannot break through, because an unconditional interference with that freedom would bring about the annihilation of the moral order of the world, which the Divine wisdom has founded on liberty. With reason, therefore," proceeds Möhler, "and quite in conformity with her inmost essence, has the Church rejected the Jansenistic proposition . . . that human freedom must yield to the omnipotence of God."²

The late Principal Tulloch, after mistakenly

¹ Hist. Fr., iii. 127.

² Symbolism, E.T., i. 122.

describing the “doctrine of a sufficient grace which is not yet sufficient” as belonging to the Jesuits,—whereas it was the Thomist combination, in “humano capiti” fashion, of the Jesuits’ formula with their own,—proceeds, in his book on “Pascal,” to say that there is “no rational position intermediate between the Pelagian doctrine of free-will and moral habit, and the Augustinian doctrine of Divine grace and spiritual inspiration.”¹ If by the latter he means the doctrine of irresistible grace, his statement is far from being true. It is true enough if “Divine grace and spiritual inspiration” be understood as imparting a needful impulse, but not as necessitating its acceptance,—as breathing a vital force into the soul, which yet may be stifled by unresponsive apathy.

One other remark is suggested by our subject. When we think of the complications, the scandals, the distresses, which attended the Jansenist controversy in its course,—of the imposition of the “Formulary,” of the question of the “droit” and

¹ “The source of character,” he says (p. 140), “is either from within the character itself, which has power to choose good and to be good if it will, or it is from a higher source, the grace of God and the power of a Divine ordination.” Why not from the action of this grace on the “character,” responded to and utilised by a stimulated, but freely consenting will?

the “fait,” of the slow and painful extinction of Port Royal, of the unreal “pacification” of Clement IX., of the revival of agitation about Quesnel’s “Reflexions,”—of the “Constitution,” so called, “Unigenitus,” extorted by Jesuit pressure from Clement XI.,—of the prolonged strife in which recalcitrant Jansenism was instinctively supported by the parliament,—of Archbishop de Beaumont “spending his life,” as Carlyle says, in debarring from the sacraments those who, as “anti-Constitutionists,” could not produce “tickets of confession,”—of the revenge which an Erastianised remnant of Jansenism was at last able to take upon the hierarchy through a very different “constitution,” devised in the main by Armand Camus,¹—we gain a yet more vivid conception of the momentousness of the life and work of the great bishop of Hippo. It is not too much to say that a question as to the purport of his teaching between two parties who agreed in accepting him, though not to the same extent, as an authority, is proved by its direct unquestionable results to have been a real contribution to the accumulation of those explosive forces which produced the Revolution of revolutions in 1789

¹ See Jervis, *The Gallican Church and the Revolution*, pp. 22, 57.

INDEX.

A

Absolutism of tone in theology, 176
Abuses, impatience to remove, 72
Acacian Arians, 34
Acacius, bishop, 78
"Academic" scepticism, 121
Adams, the two, 173, 242
Adeodatus, 116, 124
Adrumetum, monks of, 295
Ælian, proconsul, 278
Actius, 232
Alexander of Alexandria, 4
Alexander VII., 307
Alexandria, council of, 193; powers of see of, 27
Alexandrian Fathers, 14, 186
"Alexandrianism," 110
Alfius Cæcilianus, 275
Allegorism, 57
Alphius, 98
Alypius, 118, 124
Ambrose, 122, 124, 187, 286
Anomœans, 35, 60, 231
Anselm, 199
Ante-Nicene writers, 186
"Anthropomorphisms" in Old Testament, 79
Antioch, people of, 55; synod of, 86
Apollinarism, 29, 270
Aquinas, Thomas, 199, 287, 304
Arabissus, 99
Arbitration by bishops, 130
Arcadius, 59, 87
Arianism, 11; issues raised by it, 16

Arsenius, 6

Ascension Day, 135
Athanasius, exiles of, 4; chief characteristics of, 27; summary of career of, 204; death of, 46
Audians, 79
Augentius, 276
Augustine, early years of, 115; conversion of, 124, 170; death of, 181

B

Baius, 305
Baptism, belief in efficacy of, 174, 177, 179; delay of, 50
Baptistery, scenes in a, 87
Baro, 305
Basil, friend of Chrysostom, 51
Basil of Cæsarea, 22, 26, 30, 237
Belief, a reasonable principle, 123, 144
Bishops, a mark for captious censure, 221, 238
Browning, on original sin, 167

C

Cæcilian, bishop, 278
Cæsarea in Cappadocia, 90
Calvinism, 109, 179
Carteria, 94
Carthage, schools of learning at, 116
Cassian, 294
Cassisiacum, 12

Catechising, 131
 Celestine I., 204
 Chalcedon, council of, 77, 193
 Christ, absolute devotion to, 16, 26
 Chrysostom, early life of, 49; death of, 105; moral of career of, 107
 Church, Augustine on the, 111, 280
 Circumcellions, 149
 "City of God," idea of the, 132, 263
 Clement VIII., 306
 Clergy, secularised tone of, 59, 71
 Coadjutor bishop, a, 127
 Coequality, the, of the Son, 189
 Coinherence, the Divine, 37, 193
 Comana, 105
 Community of clerics, a, 128
 Compromises with Paganism, 261
 "Confessions" of Augustine, 112
 Conscience, questions of, 257
 Consistency of teaching and conduct, 63, 133
 Constans, 5
 Constantine, 7
 Constantinople, character of people of, 84; dignity of see of, 58, 77
 Constantius, emperor, 10, 33
 Constantius, priest, 98
 Controversy, need of equity in, 147
 Corn-ships, 5
 Courtiers, 74
 Criminals, intercession for, 130
 Cyriacus, 95
 Cyril of Alexandria, 198
 Cyril of Jerusalem, 187

D

Deaconesses, 71, 95
 De Broglie on Athanasius, 25
 Deceit for a good end, 53
 Diocesan jurisdiction, 81
 Dionysius of Alexandria, 188
 Disappointments as to the cause of faith, 43
 Discipline, ecclesiastical, 151

Dispensations, the two, 147
 Dissensions of Christians, 66, 260
 "Divine," vague use of term, 15
 Dominicans on grace, 304, 307
 Donatism, 148, 275
 Dualism, 141

E

Easter-eve, 64, 87, 253
 "Efficacious grace," 176, 307
 "Effluence," the Son not an, 187
 Ephesus, church of, 77
 Epictetus, letter to, 299
 Epiphanius, 28, 81
 Eternal Sonship, the, 15, 186
 Ethiopia, 8
 Eucharist, hour of, 253; profanation of, 87
 Endoxia, 78, 85, 86
 Eunomius, 60, 232
 Eutropius, 59
 Eutychianism, 197
 Evethius, 92
 Evidences of Christianity, 259
 Evil, question of, 118, 271; presence of, in the Church, 152
 Example of Christ, the, 203, 291
 Exhortations amid affliction, 94

F

Fall, doctrine of the, 159, 166, 174, 242
 Fasting before Communion, 252
 Fatalism, 212, 296
 Faustus, 121, 141, 146
 Felix, bishop, 150, 276
 Felix, Manichean, 143
 "Festal Letters," the, 43
 "Five Propositions," the, 176, 306
 Fount and stream, image of, 190
 Flavian, bishop of Antioch, 54
 Free-will, 67, 164, 176, 243
 Friendship, 94
 Frumentius, 8

G

Games, the public, 94
 Gerontius, 77
 Gibbon on Athanasius, 10
 Gnosticism, 22, 212
 God, idea of, impaired by Arianism, 19; completely manifest in the Son, 23
 Good Friday, 64
 Goths, Arian, 76
 Gottschalk, 178
 Grace, full sense of, 162; inadequate senses of, 289; not irresistible, 175, 305
 Grammar, teaching of, 115, 119
 Greek nature, gifts and defects of, 10, 64
 Gregory Nazianzen, 70, 214, 234

H

Heathen, goodness among, 174
 Heaven, bliss of, 267
 Hilary, layman, 295
 Hilary of Arles, 295
 Hilary of Poitiers, 28, 295
 Hippo, 126
 Holy Spirit, personal action of the, 163
 "Homoion," the, 34
 "Homofousion," the, 34
 "Homousion," the, 14, 188
 Honoratus of Arles, 295
 Hooker on Athanasius, 3, 26, 44; on the Personal Union, 198; on Semi-Pelagianism, 298
 "Hortensius," the, of Cicero, 117
 Hosius, 34
 Human nature, knowledge of, 30
 Hymnetius, 17
 Hymnody, 126
 "Hypostasis," sense of, 36, 192, 215
 "Hypostatic Union," the, 197

I

Ideal, the Donatist, 150
 Idealism as to New Testament, 145
 Idolatry, Arians charged with, 20
 Idols, destruction of, 76
 Illustrations, use of familiar, 30, 60, 136
 "Image of the Father," the, 24, 192
 Incarnation, doctrine of the, 24, 39, 43, 194, 238
 Individualist theory, 111
 Ingentius, 276
 Innocent I., 86, 101
 Innocent X., 307
 Instrumental character of ministers, 155
 "Invisible Church," modern theory of, 280
 Isaurians, 92, 97, 99
 Ischyras, 6
 Isidore of Pelusium, 216

J

Jansenism, 176, 306
 Jesuits, opposed to Augustinianism, 304
 "Jesus," Manichean use of the name, 141
 "Johnians," 87, 102
 Jovian, 9
 Judaic rites, 213, 253
 Julian, emperor, 4, 45
 Julian of Eclanum, 171, 178, 292
 Julius I., 7, 28

K

Keble on Athanasius, 42
 Kingdom of Christ, the, 266
 "Knowing God," in what sense, 234
 Knowledge, Manichean promise of, 143

L

Lambeth Articles, the, 305
 Laud, archbishop, 74
 Lent, 42, 56
 Leo, "Tome" of, 199
 Lerins, monastery of, 295
 Libanius, 48, 218
 Libels on Athanasius, 5
 Liberius, 33
 Licentius, 125
 Liturgical prayers, 293, 300
 "Logos," the title, how misused, 186
 Love and fear, 67
 "Lyra Apostolica," the, 2, 8, 107

M

Macedonianism, 194
 Macedonius, "Vicar of Africa," 264
 Magic, 6, 260
 "Man," used for Christ's manhood, 199
 Manhood really assumed in the Incarnation, 40
 Manicheism, 118, 140
 Marcellinus, friend of Athanasius, 200
 Marcellinus, tribune, 258, 264
 Marcellus, 28, 187, 193
 Marseilles, clergy of, 295
 Materialistic notions, 142, 188
 Matter held to be impure, 140
 Maurus, bishop, 277
 Mediation, the, 173
 Meletius of Antioch, 50, 54
 Meletius of Lycopolis, 32
 Milan, Augustine at, 122; Council of, 114
 Möhler on grace and free-will, 310
 Molina, 306
 "Monarchia," the, 39
 Monica, 117, 124; death of, 125
 Monks, disorderliness, of, 73, 91; bigotry of, 79

Morality, the evangelical, 259
 Moral order, the, inferior to physical, 143
 — training of man, gradual, 147
 Mozley, Prof., 21, 145, 271, 291
 Music in church, 7

N

Nectarius, 58, 70, 73
 Nestorianism, 158, 191, 198
 "New Thomists," 307
 Newman, Cardinal, on Athanasius, 2, 17, 27, 31, 197; on Chrysostom, 61, 90, 98, 108; on Augustine, 110
 Nicæa, 89
 Nicene Creed, original form of, 13; recension of, 194
 Nicomedia, see of, 77
 Nitria, 249

O

Oak, council of the, 82
 Oaths, rash or irreverent, 55, 129
 Objections to Christianity, 66, 132, 258
 Old Testament rejected by Manicheans, 146
 Olympias, 70, 87, 94, 96
 Orange, council of, 177, 302
 Oratory, passion for, 230
 Ordination must be episcopal, 6
 Origen, 79, 186, 188, 247
 "Original sin," 166, 174, 243
 Ostia, 125
 Otreius, bishop, 100
 "Ousia," sense of, 14, 193

P

Pagans, 19, 65, 96, 98, 100, 137, 257, 263
 Palestine, council of, 289; paganism in, 76

Palladius, 59, 104, 249
 Pascal, 307
 Pastoral spirit, the, 61, 134
 Paul of Constantinople, 89
 Paul of Samosata, 14, 189, 214
 Paul, St., study of, 58, 123, 171
 Paul V., 306
 Pelagianism, 158, 289; modern form of, 160
 Penal legislation, 156
 Penance, administration of, 131
 Penitents, mercy for, 69
 Petilianus, 285
 Pharetrius, 91
 Phœnicia, mission to, 89, 98, 101
 Photinianism, 199
 Photius, 68
 Pityus, 104
 Pontitianus, 123
 Practical religion, 7, 42, 58, 68
 Prayer, perseverance in, 95, 126
 Prayers of Augustine, 139, 163
 Preaching, 61, 96, 133, 207
 Predestination, 171, 178, 281, 296
 Prevenient grace, 175, 298, 305
 Priesthood, the ministerial and the lay, 112
 "Projection," the Son not a, 188
 Property, ecclesiastical, administration of, 130
 Prosper, 295
 Psalms, use of the, 200; the penitential, 181
 Publicola, 257
 Pure Church, desire for a, 151

Q

Questions, insoluble, to be avoided, 67, 235
 "Quicunque Vult," the, 37, 268

R

Ransoming of captives, 98
 Readers, 51

Reynolds, Dr., on Athanasius, 209
 Rhetoric, teaching of, 116, 120
 Romanianus, 116
 Romans, Epistle to, 171
 Rome, schools of, 122; taking of, 263

S

Sabellianism, 12, 14, 37, 190, 214
 Sacramental principle, the, 154, 179, 285
 Sardica, council of, 28
 Scripture, study of, enforced, 65; ignorant misuse of, 262
 Seal, image of a, 192
 Semi-Arianism, 34
 Semi-Pelagianism, 175, 178, 245, 292
 Serapion, archdeacon, 72
 Severian, bishop, 78
 Simplicianus, 170
 Sin, nature of, 142; degrees of, 138
 Sirmian creeds, 15, 34, 187
 Sixtus, Augustine's letter to, 171
 Socrates, 72
 Son of God, Arian view of the, 13, 16, 20, 23
 Sozomen, 62
 Soul, the, in personal relation with God, 113
 Statues, insult to the imperial, 55
 Stephens, on Chrysostom, 52, 107
 "Steward of the church," the, 72
 Study, need of, for preachers, 210
 "Subordination" of the Son, 12, 39, 189
 Sun and ray, image of, 192
 Superstitions, 65
 "Sufficient grace," 307
 Sympathy, 62, 75, 95
 Synodical action, 5, 77, 86
 Syrian school of interpretation, 57

T

"Tall Brothers," the, 80, 250
 Terms, theological, inadequate, 236

Thagaste, 114, 119	U
“Thalia,” the, 23	
Thankfulness, a perpetual duty, 84, 105	
Theatres, 64	
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 158	
Theodosius I., 56	
Theodotus, 100	
Theognostus, 188	
Theophilus of Alexandria, 60, 79, 84, 246	
Theophilus of Antioch, 186	
“Theotokos,” the title, 194	
Tillemont, 49, 61, 72, 86, 171, 245	
Timasius and James, 289	
Tradition, 19	
“Traditors,” 150, 277	
Trench, archbishop, 109	
Trent, council of, on grace, 176, 305	
Treves, Athanasius at, 7, 45	
Trials of faith and patience inevi- table, 94	
Trygetius, 125	
Tyre, council of, 6	
	V
Valens, emperor, 51	
Valentinianism, 188, 212	
Versatility, 31, 137, 241	
“Very God from Very God,” 15	
Vestments, linen, 5	
Vigils, 8	
Virgins, ecclesiastical, 239	
Vitalis, 292	
Volusianus, 258	
	W
Wace, Dr., on Athanasius, 18	
Waterland, 189	
White robes at baptism, 137	
Whitgift, archbishop, 305	
Widows, ecclesiastical, 73, 239	
Winter, severe, in Armenia, 96, 103	
Worldliness in clergy, 71, 107	

A Catalogue of Works
IN
THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE
PUBLISHED BY
MESSRS. LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

Abbey and Overton.—THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By CHARLES J. ABBEY, M.A., Rector of Checkendon, Reading, and JOHN H. OVERTON, M.A., Rector of Epworth, Doncaster, Rural Dean of Isle of Axholme. *Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Adams.—SACRED ALLEGORIES. The Shadow of the Cross—The Distant Hills—The Old Man's Home—The King's Messengers. By the Rev. WILLIAM ADAMS, M.A. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

The Four Allegories may be had separately, with Illustrations. *16mo. 1s. each. Also the Miniature Edition. Four Vols. 32mo. 1s. each; in a box, 5s.*

Aids to the Inner Life.

Edited by the Rev. W. H. HUTCHINGS, M.A., Rector of Kirkby Misperton, Yorkshire. *Five Vols. 32mo, cloth limp, 6d. each; or cloth extra, 1s. each. Sold separately.*

Also an Edition with red borders, *2s. each.*

OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST. By THOMAS A KEMPIS. In Four Books.

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR: Thoughts in Verse for the Sundays and Holy Days throughout the Year.

THE DEVOUT LIFE. By ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.

THE HIDDEN LIFE OF THE SOUL. From the French of JEAN NICOLAS GROU.

THE SPIRITUAL COMBAT. Together with the Supplement and the Path of Paradise. By LAURENCE SCUPOLI.

Andrewes.—A MANUAL FOR THE SICK; with other Devotions. By LANCELOT ANDREWES, D.D., sometime Bishop of Winchester. With Preface by H. P. LIDDEON, D.D. *24mo. 2s. 6d.*

Augustine.—THE CONFESSIONS OF ST. AUGUSTINE.
In Ten Books. Translated and Edited by the Rev. W. H. HUTCHINGS,
M.A. *Small 8vo.* 5s. *Cheap Edition.* 16mo. 2s. 6d.

Bathe.—Works by the Rev. ANTHONY BATHE, M.A.
A LENT WITH JESUS. A Plain Guide for Churchmen. Containing
Readings for Lent and Easter Week, and on the Holy Eucharist.
32mo, 1s.; or in paper cover, 6d.
WHAT I SHOULD BELIEVE. A Simple Manual of Self-Instruction
for Church People. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

Bickersteth.—Works by EDWARD HENRY BICKERSTETH, D.D.,
Bishop of Exeter.

THE LORD'S TABLE; or, Meditations on the Holy Communion
Office in the Book of Common Prayer. 16mo. 1s.; or cloth extra, 2s.
YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER: a Poem in Twelve Books.
One Shilling Edition, 18mo. *With red borders,* 16mo, 2s. 6d.
The Crown 8vo Edition (5s.) may still be had.

Blunt.—Works by the late Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, D.D.

DICTIONARY OF DOCTRINAL AND HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.
By various Writers. Edited by the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, D.D.
Imperial 8vo. 21s.

DICTIONARY OF SECTS, HERESIES, ECCLESIASTICAL PAR-
TIES AND SCHOOLS OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT. By various
Writers. Edited by the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, D.D. *Imperial*
8vo. 21s.

THE BOOK OF CHURCH LAW. Being an Exposition of the Legal
Rights and Duties of the Parochial Clergy and the Laity of the Church
of England. Revised by Sir WALTER G. F. PHILLIMORE, Bart.,
D.C.L. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

A COMPANION TO THE BIBLE: Being a Plain Commentary on
Scripture History, to the end of the Apostolic Age. *Two vols. small*
8vo. *Sold separately.*

THE OLD TESTAMENT. 3s. 6d. THE NEW TESTAMENT. 3s. 6d.

HOUSEHOLD THEOLOGY: a Handbook of Religious Information
respecting the Holy Bible, the Prayer Book, the Church, the Ministry,
Divine Worship, the Creeds, etc. etc. *Paper cover,* 16mo. 1s. Also
the Larger Edition, 3s. 6d.

Body.—Works by the Rev. GEORGE BODY, D.D., Canon of
Durham.

THE SCHOOL OF CALVARY; or, Laws of Christian Life revealed
from the Cross. A Course of Lectures delivered in substance at All
Saints', Margaret Street. *Crown 8vo.*

THE LIFE OF JUSTIFICATION: a Series of Lectures delivered in
substance at All Saints', Margaret Street. 16mo. 2s. 6d.

THE LIFE OF TEMPTATION: a Course of Lectures delivered in
substance at St. Peter's, Eaton Square; also at All Saints', Margaret
Street. 16mo. 2s. 6d.

Boultbee.—A COMMENTARY ON THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By the Rev. T. P. BOULTBEE, formerly Principal of the London College of Divinity, St. John's Hall, Highbury. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

Bright.—Works by WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Canon of Christ Church.

LESSONS FROM THE LIVES OF THREE GREAT FATHERS:

St. Athanasius, St. Chrysostom, and St. Augustine. *Crown 8vo.* 6s. THE INCARNATION AS A MOTIVE POWER. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

IONA AND OTHER VERSES. *Small 8vo.* 4s. 6d.

HYMNS AND OTHER VERSES. *Small 8vo.* 5s.

FAITH AND LIFE: Readings for the greater Holy Days, and the Sundays from Advent to Trinity. Compiled from Ancient Writers. *Small 8vo.* 5s.

Bright and Medd.—LIBER PRECUM PUBLICARUM ECCLESIAE ANGLICANAE. A GULIELMO BRIGHT, S.T.P., et PETRO GOLDSMITH MEDD, A.M., Latine redditus. [In hac Editione continentur Versiones Latinæ—1. Libri Precum Publicarum Ecclesiae Anglicanæ; 2. Liturgiæ Primiæ Reformatæ; 3. Liturgiæ Scoticanæ; 4. Liturgiæ Americanæ.] *Small 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

Browne.—AN EXPOSITION OF THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES, Historical and Doctrinal. By E. H. BROWNE, D.D., formerly Bishop of Winchester. *8vo.* 16s.

Campion and Beaumont.—THE PRAYER BOOK INTERLEAVED. With Historical Illustrations and Explanatory Notes arranged parallel to the Text. By W. M. CAMPION, D.D., and W. J. BEAMONT, M.A. *Small 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

Carter.—Works edited by the Rev. T. T. CARTER, M.A., Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

THE TREASURY OF DEVOTION: a Manual of Prayer for General and Daily Use. Compiled by a Priest. *18mo.* 2s. 6d.; *cloth limp*, 2s.; or bound with the *Book of Common Prayer*, 3s. 6d. *Large-Type Edition.* *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

THE WAY OF LIFE: A Book of Prayers and Instruction for the Young at School, with a Preparation for Confirmation. Compiled by a Priest. *18mo.* 1s. 6d.

THE PATH OF HOLINESS: a First Book of Prayers, with the Service of the Holy Communion, for the Young. Compiled by a Priest. With Illustrations. *16mo.* 1s. 6d.; *cloth limp*, 1s.

THE GUIDE TO HEAVEN: a Book of Prayers for every Want. (For the Working Classes.) Compiled by a Priest. *18mo.* 1s. 6d.; *cloth limp*, 1s. *Large-Type Edition.* *Crown 8vo.* 1s. 6d.; *cloth limp*, 1s.

[continued.]

Carter.—Works edited by the Rev. T. T. CARTER, M.A., Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford—*continued.*

SELF-RENUNCIATION. From the French. 16mo. 2s. 6d. *Also the Larger Edition. Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

THE STAR OF CHILDHOOD; a First Book of Prayers and Instruction for Children. Compiled by a Priest. With Illustrations. 16mo. 2s. 6d.

Carter.—MAXIMS AND GLEANINGS FROM THE WRITINGS OF T. T. CARTER, M.A. Selected and arranged for Daily Use. Crown 16mo. 2s.

Compton.—THE ARMOURY OF PRAYER. A Book of Devotion. Compiled by the Rev. BERDMORE COMPTON, M.A. 18mo. 3s. 6d.

Conybeare and Howson.—THE LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. By the Rev. W. J. CONYBEARE, M.A., and the Very Rev. J. S. HOWSON, D.D. With numerous Maps and Illustrations.

LIBRARY EDITION. *Two Vols. 8vo. 21s.*

STUDENT'S EDITION. *One Vol. Crown 8vo. 6s.*

Crake.—HISTORY OF THE CHURCH UNDER THE ROMAN EMPIRE, A.D. 30-476. By the Rev. A. D. CRAKE, B.A. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Creighton.—HISTORY OF THE PAPACY DURING THE REFORMATION. By the Rev. CANON CREIGHTON, M.A., LL.D. 8vo. *Vols. I. and II., 1378-1464, 32s. Vols. III. and IV., 1464-1518, 24s.*

Devotional Series, 16mo, Red Borders. *Each 2s. 6d.*

BICKERSTETH'S YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER.

CHILCOT'S EVIL THOUGHTS.

CHRISTIAN YEAR.

DEVOTIONAL BIRTHDAY BOOK.

HERBERT'S POEMS AND PROVERBS.

KEMPIS' (A) OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST.

ST. FRANCIS DE SALES' THE DEVOUT LIFE.

WILSON'S THE LORD'S SUPPER. *Large type.*

*TAYLOR'S (JEREMY) HOLY LIVING.

*— — — — — HOLY DYING.

**These two in one Volume. 5s.*

Devotional Series, 18mo, without Red Borders. *Each 1s.*

BICKERSTETH'S YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER.

CHRISTIAN YEAR.

KEMPIS' (A) OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST.

WILSON'S THE LORD'S SUPPER. *Large type.*

*TAYLOR'S (JEREMY) HOLY LIVING.

*— — — — — HOLY DYING.

**These two in one Volume. 2s. 6d.*

Edersheim.—Works by ALFRED EDERSHEIM, M.A., D.D., Ph.D., sometime Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint, Oxford.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JESUS THE MESSIAH. *Two Vols.* 8vo. 24s.

JESUS THE MESSIAH: being an Abridged Edition of 'The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.' *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

PROPHECY AND HISTORY IN RELATION TO THE MESSIAH: The Warburton Lectures, 1880-1884. 8vo. 12s.

TOHU-VA-VOHU ('Without Form and Void'): being a collection of Fragmentary Thoughts and Criticism. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

Ellicott.—Works by C. J. ELlicott, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

A CRITICAL AND GRAMMATICAL COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES. Greek Text, with a Critical and Grammatical Commentary, and a Revised English Translation. 8vo.

I CORINTHIANS. 16s.

GALATIANS. 8s. 6d.

EPHESIANS. 8s. 6d.

PASTORAL EPISTLES. 10s. 6d.

PHILIPPIANS, COLOSSIANS, AND PHILEMON. 10s. 6d.

THESSALONIANS. 7s. 6d.

HISTORICAL LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. 8vo. 12s.

Epochs of Church History. Edited by the Rev. CANON CREIGHTON, M.A., LL.D. *Facap. 8vo.* 2s. 6d. each.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN OTHER LANDS. By the Rev. H. W. TUCKER, M.A.

THE HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. By the Rev. GEO. G. PERRY, M.A.

THE CHURCH OF THE EARLY FATHERS. By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

THE EVANGELICAL REVIVAL IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By the Rev. J. H. OVERTON, M.A.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. By the Hon. G. C. BRODRICK, D.C.L.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE. By J. BASS MULLINGER M.A.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE MIDDLE AGES. By the Rev. W. HUNT, M.A.

THE CHURCH AND THE EASTERN EMPIRE. By the Rev. H. F. TOZER, M.A.

THE CHURCH AND THE ROMAN EMPIRE. By the Rev. A. CARR.

THE CHURCH AND THE PURITANS, 1570-1660. By HENRY OFFLEY WAKEMAN, M.A.

HILDEBRAND AND HIS TIMES. By the Rev. W. R. W. STEPHENS, M.A.

THE POPES AND THE HOHENSTAUFEN. By UGO BALZANI.

THE COUNTER-REFORMATION. By ADOLPHUS WILLIAM WARD, Litt. D

WYCLIFFE AND MOVEMENTS FOR REFORM. By REGINALD L. POOLE, M.A.

THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY. By H. M. GWATKIN, M.A.

Fosbery.—Works edited by the Rev. THOMAS VINCENT FOSBERY, M.A., sometime Vicar of St. Giles's, Reading.

VOICES OF COMFORT. *Cheap Edition.* Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.
The Larger Edition (7s. 6d.) may still be had.

HYMNS AND POEMS FOR THE SICK AND SUFFERING. In connection with the Service for the Visitation of the Sick. Selected from Various Authors. Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Garland.—THE PRACTICAL TEACHING OF THE APOCALYPSE. By the Rev. G. V. GARLAND, M.A. 8vo. 16s.

Gore.—Works by the Rev. CHARLES GORE, M.A., Principal of the Pusey House ; Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.

THE MINISTRY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
ROMAN CATHOLIC CLAIMS. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

Goulburn.—Works by EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D.D., D.C.L., sometime Dean of Norwich.

THOUGHTS ON PERSONAL RELIGION. Small 8vo, 6s. 6d. ; *Cheap Edition*, 3s. 6d. ; *Presentation Edition*, 2 vols. small 8vo, 10s. 6d.

THE PURSUIT OF HOLINESS : a Sequel to 'Thoughts on Personal Religion.' Small 8vo. 5s. *Cheap Edition*, 3s. 6d.

THE CHILD SAMUEL : a Practical and Devotional Commentary on the Birth and Childhood of the Prophet Samuel, as recorded in 1 Sam. i., ii. 1-27, iii. Small 8vo. 2s. 6d.

THE GOSPEL OF THE CHILDHOOD : a Practical and Devotional Commentary on the Single Incident of our Blessed Lord's Childhood (St. Luke ii. 41 to the end). *Crown 8vo.* 2s. 6d.

THE COLLECTS OF THE DAY : an Exposition, Critical and Devotional, of the Collects appointed at the Communion. With Preliminary Essays on their Structure, Sources, etc. 2 vols. *Crown 8vo.* 8s. each.

THOUGHTS UPON THE LITURGICAL GOSPELS for the Sundays, one for each day in the year. With an Introduction on their Origin, History, the Modifications made in them by the Reformers and by the Revisers of the Prayer Book. 2 vols. *Crown 8vo.* 16s.

MEDITATIONS UPON THE LITURGICAL GOSPELS for the Minor Festivals of Christ, the two first Week-days of the Easter and Whitsun Festivals, and the Red-letter Saints' Days. *Crown 8vo.* 8s. 6d.

FAMILY PRAYERS compiled from various sources (chiefly from Bishop Hamilton's Manual), and arranged on the Liturgical Principle. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d. *Cheap Edition.* 16mo. 1s.

Haddan.—APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By the Rev. ARTHUR W. HADDAN, B.D., late Rector of Barton-on-the-Heath. 8vo. 12s.

Hatch.—THE ORGANIZATION OF THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCHES. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1880. By EDWIN HATCH, M.A., D.D. 8vo. 5s.

Hernaman.—LYRA CONSOLATIONIS. From the Poets of the Seventeenth, Eighteenth, and Nineteenth Centuries. Selected and arranged by CLAUDIA FRANCES HERNAMAN. Small 8vo. 6s.

Holland.—Works by the Rev. HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND, M.A., Canon and Precentor of St. Paul's.

CREED AND CHARACTER : Sermons. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

ON BEHALF OF BELIEF. Sermons preached in St. Paul's Cathedral. Crown 8vo. 6s.

CHRIST OR ECCLESIASTES. Sermons preached in St. Paul's Cathedral. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

GOOD FRIDAY. Being Addresses on the Seven Last Words, delivered at St. Paul's Cathedral on Good Friday. Small 8vo. 2s.

LOGIC AND LIFE, with other Sermons. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Hopkins.—CHRIST THE CONSOLER. A Book of Comfort for the Sick. By ELLICE HOPKINS. Small 8vo. 2s. 6d.

James.—COMMENT UPON THE COLLECTS appointed to be used in the Church of England on Sundays and Holy Days throughout the Year. By JOHN JAMES, D.D., sometime Canon of Peterborough. Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Jameson.—Works by Mrs. JAMESON.

SACRED AND LEGENDARY ART, containing Legends of the Angels and Archangels, the Evangelists, the Apostles, the Doctors of the Church, St. Mary Magdalene, the Patron Saints, the Martyrs, the Early Bishops, the Hermits, and the Warrior-Saints of Christendom, as represented in the Fine Arts. With 19 etchings on Copper and Steel, and 187 Woodcuts. Two Vols. Cloth, gilt top, 20s. net.

LEGENDS OF THE MONASTIC ORDERS, as represented in the Fine Arts, comprising the Benedictines and Augustines, and Orders derived from their Rules, the Mendicant Orders, the Jesuits, and the Order of the Visitation of S. Mary. With 11 etchings by the Author, and 88 Woodcuts. One Vol. Cloth, gilt top, 10s. net.

LEGENDS OF THE MADONNA, OR BLESSED VIRGIN MARY. Devotional with and without the Infant Jesus, Historical from the Annunciation to the Assumption, as represented in Sacred and Legendary Christian Art. With 27 Etchings and 165 Woodcuts. One Vol. Cloth, gilt top, 10s. net.

THE HISTORY OF OUR LORD, as exemplified in Works of Art, with that of His Types, St. John the Baptist, and other Persons of the Old and New Testaments. Commenced by the late Mrs. JAMESON; continued and completed by LADY EASTLAKE. With 31 etchings and 281 Woodcuts. Two Vols. 8vo. 20s. net.

Jennings.—**ECCLESIA ANGLICANA.** A History of the Church of Christ in England from the Earliest to the Present Times. By the Rev. ARTHUR CHARLES JENNINGS, M.A. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

Jukes.—Works by ANDREW JUKES.

THE NEW MAN AND THE ETERNAL LIFE. Notes on the Reiterated Amens of the Son of God. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

THE NAMES OF GOD IN HOLY SCRIPTURE: a Revelation of His Nature and Relationships. *Crown 8vo.* 4s. 6d.

THE TYPES OF GENESIS. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

THE SECOND DEATH AND THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

THE MYSTERY OF THE KINGDOM. *Crown 8vo.* 2s. 6d.

Keble.—MAXIMS AND GLEANINGS FROM THE WRITINGS OF JOHN KEBLE, M.A. Selected and Arranged for Daily Use. By C. M. S. *Crown 16mo.* 2s.

SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF JOHN KEBLE, M.A. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

Kennaway.—CONSOLATIO; OR, COMFORT FOR THE AFFLICTED. Edited by the late Rev. C. E. KENNAWAY. *16mo.* 2s. 6d.

Knox Little.—Works by W. J. KNOX LITTLE, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Worcester, and Vicar of Hoar Cross.

THE CHRISTIAN HOME. *Crown 8vo.*

THE HOPES AND DECISIONS OF THE PASSION OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

THE THREE HOURS' AGONY OF OUR BLESSED REDEEMER. Being Addresses in the form of Meditations delivered in St. Alban's Church, Manchester, on Good Friday, 1877. *Small 8vo.* 2s. ; or in Paper Cover, 1s.

CHARACTERISTICS AND MOTIVES OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. Ten Sermons preached in Manchester Cathedral, in Lent and Advent 1877. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

SERMONS PREACHED FOR THE MOST PART IN MANCHESTER. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

THE MYSTERY OF THE PASSION OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

THE WITNESS OF THE PASSION OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

THE LIGHT OF LIFE. Sermons preached on Various Occasions. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

SUNLIGHT AND SHADOW IN THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. Sermons preached for the most part in America. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d

Lear.—Works by, and Edited by, H. L. SIDNEY LEAR.

CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHIES. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.*

MADAME LOUISE DE FRANCE, Daughter of Louis XV., known also as the Mother Térèse de St. Augustin.

FOR DAYS AND YEARS. A Book containing a Text, Short Reading, and Hymn for Every Day in the Church's Year. *16mo. 2s. 6d. Also a Cheap Edition, 32mo. 1s.; or cloth gilt, 1s. 6d.*

FIVE MINUTES. Daily Readings of Poetry. *16mo. 3s. 6d. Also a Cheap Edition. 32mo. 1s.; or cloth gilt, 1s. 6d.*

WEARINESS. A Book for the Languid and Lonely. *Large Type. Small 8vo. 5s.*

THE LIGHT OF THE CONSCIENCE. *16mo. 2s. 6d. Also the Larger Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s.*

A DOMINICAN ARTIST: a Sketch of the Life of the Rev. Père Besson, of the Order of St. Dominic.

HENRI PERREYVE. By A. GRATRY. ST. FRANCIS DE SALES, Bishop and Prince of Geneva.

THE REVIVAL OF PRIESTLY LIFE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY IN FRANCE.

A CHRISTIAN PAINTER OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BOSSUET AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES.

FÉNELON, ARCHBISHOP OF CAMBRAI.

HENRI DOMINIQUE LACORDAIRE.

DEVOTIONAL WORKS. Edited by H. L. SIDNEY LEAR. *New and Uniform Editions. Nine Vols. 16mo. 2s. 6d. each.*

FÉNELON'S SPIRITUAL LETTERS TO MEN.

FÉNELON'S SPIRITUAL LETTERS TO WOMEN.

A SELECTION FROM THE SPIRITUAL LETTERS OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.

THE SPIRIT OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.

THE HIDDEN LIFE OF THE SOUL.

THE LIGHT OF THE CONSCIENCE.

SELF-RENUNCIATION. From the French.

ST. FRANCIS DE SALES' OF THE LOVE OF GOD.

SELECTIONS FROM PASCAL'S THOUGHTS.

Library of Spiritual Works for English Catholics. *Original Edition. With Red Borders. Small 8vo. 5s. each. New and Cheaper Editions. 16mo. 2s. 6d. each.*

OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST.

THE SPIRITUAL COMBAT. By LAURENCE SCUPOLI.

THE DEVOUT LIFE. By ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.

OF THE LOVE OF GOD. By ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.

THE CONFESSIONS OF ST. AUGUSTINE. *In Ten Books.*

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR. *5s. Edition only.*

Liddon.—Works by HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., late Canon Residentiary and Chancellor of St. Paul's.

THE DIVINITY OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1866. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

ADVENT IN ST. PAUL'S. Sermons bearing chiefly on the Two Comings of our Lord. *Two Vols.* *Crown 8vo.* 5s. each. *Cheap edition in one Volume.* *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

CHRISTMASTIDE IN ST. PAUL'S. Sermons bearing chiefly on the Birth of our Lord and the End of the Year. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

PASSIONTIDE IN ST. PAUL'S. Sermons bearing chiefly on the Passion of our Lord. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

EASTER IN ST. PAUL'S. Sermons bearing chiefly on the Resurrection of our Lord. *Two Vols.* *Crown 8vo.* 5s. each. *Cheap Edition in one Volume.* *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. *Two Vols.* *Crown 8vo.* 5s. each. *Cheap Edition in one Volume.* *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

THE MAGNIFICAT. Sermons in St. Paul's. *Crown 8vo.* 2s. 6d.

SOME ELEMENTS OF RELIGION. Lent Lectures. *Small 8vo.* 2s. 6d. ; or in Paper Cover, 1s. 6d.

The Crown 8vo Edition (5s.) may still be had.

SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF H. P. LIDDON, D.D. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

MAXIMS AND GLEANINGS FROM THE WRITINGS OF H. P. LIDDON, D.D. Selected and arranged by C. M. S. *Crown 16mo.* 2s.

Littlehales.—Works Edited by HENRY LITTLEHALES.

A FOURTEENTH CENTURY PRAYER BOOK : being Pages in Facsimile from a Layman's Prayer Book in English about 1400 A.D. *4to.* 3s. 6d.

THE PRYMER OR PRAYER-BOOK OF THE LAY PEOPLE IN THE MIDDLE AGES. In English, dating about 1400 A.D. Part I. Text. *Royal 8vo.* 5s.

Luckock.—Works by HERBERT MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D., Canon of Ely.

AFTER DEATH. An Examination of the Testimony of Primitive Times respecting the State of the Faithful Dead, and their Relationship to the Living. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE BETWEEN DEATH AND JUDGMENT. Being a Sequel to *After Death.* *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

FOOTPRINTS OF THE SON OF MAN, as traced by St. Mark. Being Eighty Portions for Private Study, Family Reading, and Instructions in Church. *Two Vols.* *Crown 8vo.* 12s. *Cheap Edition in one Vol.* *Crown 8vo.* 5s.



[continued.]

Luckock.—Works by HERBERT MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D., Canon of Ely—*continued*.

THE DIVINE LITURGY. Being the Order for Holy Communion, Historically, Doctrinally, and Devotionally set forth, in Fifty Portions. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. The Anglican Reform—The Puritan Innovations—The Elizabethan Reaction—The Caroline Settlement. With Appendices. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

THE BISHOPS IN THE TOWER. A Record of Stirring Events affecting the Church and Nonconformists from the Restoration to the Revolution. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

LYRA APOSTOLICA. Poems by J. W. BOWDEN, R. H. FROUDE, J. KEBLE, J. H. NEWMAN, R. I. WILBERFORCE, and I. WILLIAMS; and New Preface by CARDINAL NEWMAN. *16mo.* 2s. 6d.

LYRA GERMANICA. Hymns translated from the German by CATHERINE WINKWORTH. *Small 8vo.* 5s.

MacColl.—CHRISTIANITY IN RELATION TO SCIENCE AND MORALS. By the Rev. MALCOLM MACCOLL, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Ripon. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

Mason.—Works by A. J. MASON, D.D., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

THE FAITH OF THE GOSPEL. A Manual of Christian Doctrine. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d. *Large-Paper Edition for Marginal Notes.* 4to. 12s. 6d.

THE RELATION OF CONFIRMATION TO BAPTISM. As taught by the Western Fathers. A Study in the History of Doctrine. *Crown 8vo.*

Mercier.—Works by Mrs. JEROME MERCIER.

OUR MOTHER CHURCH: being Simple Talk on High Topics. *Small 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

THE STORY OF SALVATION: or, Thoughts on the Historic Study of the Bible. *Small 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

Moberly.—Works by GEORGE MOBERLY, D.C.L., late Bishop of Salisbury.

PLAIN SERMONS. Preached at Brightstone. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

THE SAYINGS OF THE GREAT FORTY DAYS, between the Resurrection and Ascension, regarded as the Outlines of the Kingdom of God. In Five Discourses. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS. Mostly preached at Brightstone. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

SERMONS PREACHED AT WINCHESTER COLLEGE. *Two Vols.* *Small 8vo.* 6s. 6d. each.

Mozley.—Works by J. B. MOZLEY, D.D., late Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford.

ESSAYS, HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL. *Two Vols. 8vo. 2s.*

EIGHT LECTURES ON MIRACLES. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1865. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

RULING IDEAS IN EARLY AGES AND THEIR RELATION TO OLD TESTAMENT FAITH. Lectures delivered to Graduates of the University of Oxford. *8vo. 10s. 6d.*

SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, and on Various Occasions. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

SERMONS, PAROCHIAL AND OCCASIONAL. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Mozley.—Works by the Rev. T. MOZLEY, M.A., Author of 'Reminiscences of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement.'

THE WORD. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

LETTERS FROM ROME ON THE OCCASION OF THE ECUMENICAL COUNCIL 1869-1870. *Two Vols. Cr. 8vo. 18s.*

Newbolt.—Works by the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's.

THE FRUIT OF THE SPIRIT. Being Ten Addresses bearing on the Spiritual Life. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

THE MAN OF GOD. Being Six Addresses delivered during Lent 1886, at the Primary Ordination of the Right Rev. the Lord Alwyne Compton, Bishop of Ely. *Small 8vo. 1s. 6d.*

COUNSELS OF FAITH AND PRACTICE. Being Sermons preached on Various Occasions. *8vo. 7s. 6d.*

THE VOICE OF THE PRAYER BOOK. Being Spiritual Addresses bearing on the Book of Common Prayer. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Newnham.—THE ALL-FATHER: Sermons preached in a Village Church. By the Rev. H. P. NEWNHAM. With Preface by EDNA LYALL. *Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

Newman.—Works by JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, B.D. (Cardinal Newman), formerly Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford.

PAROCHIAL AND PLAIN SERMONS. *Eight Vols. Cabinet Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s. each. Popular Edition. Eight Vols. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.*

[continued.]

Newman.—Works by JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, B.D. (Cardinal Newman), formerly Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford—*continued*.

SELECTION, ADAPTED TO THE SEASONS OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR, from the 'Parochial and Plain Sermons.' *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

FIFTEEN SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, between A.D. 1826 and 1843. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

SERMONS BEARING UPON SUBJECTS OF THE DAY. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

LECTURES ON THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

* * * For the Catholic Works of Cardinal Newman, see Messrs. Longmans & Co.'s Catalogue of Works in General Literature.

THE LETTERS AND CORRESPONDENCE OF JOHN HENRY NEWMAN DURING HIS LIFE IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH. With a Brief Autobiographical Memoir. Arranged and Edited by ANNE MOZLEY. *Two Vols. 8vo.* 30s. net.

Osborne.—Works by EDWARD OSBORNE, Mission Priest of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley, Oxford.

THE CHILDREN'S SAVIOUR. Instructions to Children on the Life of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. *Illustrated. 16mo.* 3s. 6d.

THE SAVIOUR-KING. Instructions to Children on Old Testament Types and Illustrations of the Life of Christ. *Illustrated. 16mo.* 3s. 6d.

THE CHILDREN'S FAITH. Instructions to Children on the Apostles' Creed. *With Illustrations. 16mo.* 3s. 6d.

Oxenden.—Works by the Right Rev. ASHTON OXENDEN, formerly Bishop of Montreal.

THE PATHWAY OF SAFETY; or, Counsel to the Awakened. *Feap. 8vo, large type.* 2s. 6d. *Cheap Edition. Small type, limp.* 1s.

THE EARNEST COMMUNICANT. *Common Edition. 32mo.* 1s. *New Red Rubric Edition. 32mo.* 2s.

OUR CHURCH AND HER SERVICES. *Feap. 8vo.* 2s. 6d.

FAMILY PRAYERS FOR FOUR WEEKS. First Series. *Feap. 8vo.* 2s. 6d. Second Series. *Feap. 8vo.* 2s. 6d.

LARGE TYPE EDITION. Two Series in one Volume. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

COTTAGE SERMONS; or, Plain Words to the Poor. *Feap. 8vo.* 2s. 6d.

THOUGHTS FOR HOLY WEEK. *16mo.* 1s. 6d.

DECISION. *18mo.* 1s. 6d.

[continued.]

Oxenden.—Works by the Right Rev. ASHTON OXENDEN, formerly Bishop of Montreal—*continued.*

THE HOME BEYOND ; or, A Happy Old Age. *Ccap. 8vo.* 1s. 6d.

THE LABOURING MAN'S BOOK. *18mo, large type, cloth.* 1s. 6d.

CONFIRMATION. *18mo, cloth.* 9d.; *sewed, 3d.*; or 2s. 6d. per dozen.

THE LORD'S SUPPER SIMPLY EXPLAINED. *18mo, cloth.* 1s. *Cheap Edition. Paper.* 6d.

COUNSELS TO THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN CONFIRMED ; or, Now is the Time to serve Christ. *18mo, cloth.* 1s.

PRAYERS FOR PRIVATE USE. *32mo, cloth.* 1s.

WORDS OF PEACE ; or, The Blessings of Sickness. *16mo, cloth.* 1s.

Paget.—Works by the Rev. FRANCIS PAGET, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology.

THE SPIRIT OF DISCIPLINE: Sermons. *Crown 8vo.*

FACULTIES AND DIFFICULTIES FOR BELIEF AND DISBELIEF. *Crown 8vo.* 6s. 6d.

THE HALLOWING OF WORK. Addresses given at Eton, January 16-18, 1888. *Small 8vo.* 2s.

PRACTICAL REFLECTIONS. By a CLERGYMAN. With Prefaces by H. P. LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L. *Crown 8vo.*

Vol. I.—THE HOLY GOSPELS. 4s. 6d.

Vol. II.—ACTS TO REVELATION. 6s.

THE PSALMS. 5s.

PRIEST (THE) TO THE ALTAR ; Or, Aids to the Devout Celebration of Holy Communion, chiefly after the Ancient English Use of Sarum. *Royal 8vo.* 12s.

Pusey.—Works by the late Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

MAXIMS AND GLEANINGS FROM THE WRITINGS OF EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY, D.D. Selected and Arranged for Daily Use. By C. M. S. *Crown 16mo.* 2s.

PRIVATE PRAYERS. With Preface by H. P. LIDDON, D.D. *32mo.* 2s. 6d.

PRAYERS FOR A YOUNG SCHOOLBOY. Edited, with a Preface, by H. P. LIDDON, D.D. *24mo.* 1s.

SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY, D.D. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

Richmond.—CHRISTIAN ECONOMICS. By the Rev. WILFRID RICHMOND, M.A., sometime Warden of Trinity College, Glenalmond. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

Sanday.—THE ORACLES OF GOD: Nine Lectures on the Nature and Extent of Biblical Inspiration and the Special Significance of the Old Testament Scriptures at the Present Time. By W. SANDAY, M.A., D.D., LL.D. *Crown 8vo.* 4s.

Seebohm.—THE OXFORD REFORMERS—JOHN COLET, ERASMUS, AND THOMAS MORE: A History of their Fellow-Work. By FREDERICK SEEBOHM. *8vo.* 14s.

Stephen.—ESSAYS IN ECCLESIASTICAL BIOGRAPHY. By the Right Hon. Sir J. STEPHEN. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

Swayne.—THE BLESSED DEAD IN PARADISE. Four All Saints' Day Sermons, preached in Salisbury Cathedral. By ROBERT G. SWAYNE, M.A. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

Tweddell.—THE SOUL IN CONFLICT. A Practical Examination of some Difficulties and Duties of the Spiritual Life. By MARSHALL TWEDDELL, M.A., Vicar of St. Saviour, Paddington. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

Twells.—COLLOQUIES ON PREACHING. By HENRY TWELLS, M.A., Honorary Canon of Peterborough *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

Wakeman.—THE HISTORY OF RELIGION IN ENGLAND. By HENRY OFFLEY WAKEMAN, M.A. *Small 8vo.* 1s. 6d.

Welldon.—THE FUTURE AND THE PAST. Sermons preached to Harrow Boys. (*First Series, 1885 and 1886.*) By the Rev. J. E. C. WELLDON, M.A., Head Master of Harrow School. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

Williams.—Works by the Rev. ISAAC WILLIAMS, B.D., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.

A DEVOTIONAL COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL NARRATIVE. *Eight Vols.* *Crown 8vo.* 5s. each. *Sold separately.*

THOUGHTS ON THE STUDY OF THE HOLY GOSPELS. OUR LORD'S MINISTRY (Third Year).

A HARMONY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS. THE HOLY WEEK.

OUR LORD'S NATIVITY. OUR LORD'S PASSION.

OUR LORD'S MINISTRY (Second Year). OUR LORD'S RESURRECTION.

[continued.]

Williams.—Works by the Rev. ISAAC WILLIAMS, B.D., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford—*continued*.

FEMALE CHARACTERS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. A Series of Sermons. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

THE CHARACTERS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. A Series of Sermons. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

THE APOCALYPSE. With Notes and Reflections. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

SERMONS ON THE EPISTLES AND GOSPELS FOR THE SUNDAYS AND HOLY DAYS THROUGHOUT THE YEAR. Two Vols. *Crown 8vo.* 5s. each.

PLAIN SERMONS ON THE CATECHISM. Two Vols. *Crown 8vo.* 5s. each.

SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF ISAAC WILLIAMS, B.D. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

Woodford.—Works by JAMES RUSSELL WOODFORD, D.D., sometime Lord Bishop of Ely.

THE GREAT COMMISSION. Twelve Addresses on the Ordinal. Edited, with an Introduction on the Ordinations of his Episcopate, by HERBERT MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

SERMONS ON OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT SUBJECTS. Edited by HERBERT MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D. Two Vols. *Crown 8vo.* 5s. each.

Wordsworth.—Works by ELIZABETH WORDSWORTH, Principal of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE CREED. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

ELIZABETH AND OTHER POEMS. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

Younghusband.—Works by FRANCES YOUNGHUSBAND.

THE STORY OF OUR LORD, told in Simple Language for Children. With 25 Illustrations on Wood from Pictures by the Old Masters, and numerous Ornamental Borders, Initial Letters, etc., from Longmans' New Testament. *Crown 8vo.* 2s. 6d.

THE STORY OF GENESIS, told in Simple Language for Children. *Crown 8vo.* 2s. 6d.

26
27



1 1012 01210 5864

DATE DUE

AL BOOK SHOP Inc.

GOOD BOOKS

WANTED AND SOLD

N. Y. C.

337

